TRANSFIGURATION AND DISCIPLESHIP IN MATTHEW

A dissertation by

Thomas F. Best

presented to

The Faculty of the
Graduate Theological Union

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Berkeley, California
April 1, 1974

Committee Signatures:

Thomas W. Leahy
Chairman

Wilhelm Wuellner

John L. Boyle

John R. Dillon

Michael D. Guinan

XUM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter

I. MATTHEW'S ACCOUNT OF THE TRANSFIGURATION 12

A Source-Critical and Structural Analysis of Matthew 17:1-9 12
Structural Techniques in Matthew 17:1-9 40
Conclusion: The Composition of Matthew 17:1-9 57

II. MATTHEW'S SEVEN MOUNTAINS 60

The Seven Mountains 60
A Form-Critical Analysis of the Seven Mountains 72
The Seven Mountains and the Structure of Matthew's Gospel 97
The Composition of Matthew's Seven Mountains 107

III. THE THEOLOGY OF MATTHEW'S TRANSFIGURATION ACCOUNT 118

The Purpose of Matthew 17:1-9 118
Discipleship and Structure in Matthew's Gospel 158
Conclusion: The Purpose of Matthew 17:1-9 183

CONCLUSION: DISCIPLESHIP AS TRANSFIGURATION IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW 184

BIBLIOGRAPHY 188

XUM

INTRODUCTION

Forty years ago Johannes Wilkens complained that a "morbid fascination with individual pericopes" was stifling New Testament research.[1] Of this malady the study of the transfiguration is Exhibit "A." The history of this study is available elsewhere;[2] we will not recite it here, but simply sketch the logic of its development and indicate where progress can now be expected.

The study of the transfiguration has been the study of its themes, particularly those appearing in the Markan account (9:2-8).[3] Perhaps this was inevitable in light of the material itself. For the transfiguration narrative is pregnant with motifs, and motifs of such intrinsic importance that, as G. B. Caird commented, "almost every item . . . can be made the starting-point of a theory."[4] The basic material for thematic study of the transfiguration—certainly that residuum of data which sustains the writers of commentaries—had already been presented, with admirable clarity and conciseness, by R. C. Trench in 1867.[1] The weakness of this approach has been its tendency to fragment the narrative into a collection of unconnected motifs.

---

[1] Johannes Wilkens, Der König Israels (Berlin: Furche-Verlag, 1934), p. 5. The term was Perikopenkrankheit. Wilkens' discussion is prophetic of both redaction and literary criticism, as in the plea, from the same context, that "wir müssen lernen, das Evangelium in seinen grossen Zusammenhängen, in seiner ihm eigenen Geschichtlichkeit als Ganzes zu sehen und zu lesen."

[2] Harald Riesenfeld, Jésus Transfiguré, Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 16 (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1947), pp. 1-6. Heinrich Baltensweiler, Die Verklärung Jesu: Historisches Ereignis und synoptische Berichte (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1959) offers a concise survey in his opening discussion. See also Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, 2nd ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966), pp. 386-88.

[3] All citations not explicitly identified in the text are understood to refer to the gospel of Matthew.

[4] G. B. Caird, "The Transfiguration," Expository Times 67 (1955-56): 291.

For this reason, thematic study has been most fruitful in combination with other disciplines. Lohmeyer's famous article isolated two "streams" within Mark 9:2-8, identifying them with a "hellenistic" and a "Jewish" viewpoint.[2] This combination of source criticism and history-of-religions research continues to inspire students.[3] The culmination of thematic studies of the transfiguration—also produced by the history-of-religions school, and perhaps the most important single work on the subject—was Riesenfeld's dissertation, *Jésus Transfiguré*. This transcended the thematic approach in its search for a single, overarching "purpose," a dominant motif through which to understand the account as a whole. The motivation was perhaps even more important than Riesenfeld's specific explanation of the account as the enthronement of the eschatological king.[4]

---

[1] R. C. Trench, *Studies in the Gospels* (New York: Scribner & Co., 1867), pp. 184-214.

[2] Ernst Lohmeyer, "Die Verklärung Jesu nach dem Markus-Evangelium," *ZNTW* 21 (1922): 185-215.

[3] W. Gerber, "Die Metamorphose Jesu, Mark.9,2f. par.," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 23 (1967): 385-95, is probably the most outstanding recent example.

[4] The last book devoted to the transfiguration (Baltensweiler, *Die Verklärung Jesu*) really belongs to this approach. But its concern to locate the historical event in Jesus' life to which Mark 9:2-8 refers led it into areas usually avoided by the history-of-religions school. This concern was, in the theological climate of its time, a distinct liability.

XUM

Theological understanding of the transfiguration account was associated particularly with the rise of form-criticism. To the form-critics the transfiguration was a tradition looking for a Sitz-im-Leben; they found one in the resurrection accounts. The view of the transfiguration as a misplaced resurrection account is often laid at Bultmann's door, but he himself regards it as received scholarly tradition, going back to the fertile Wellhausen himself.[1] Its corollary, that the transfiguration as it now stands in the synoptic tradition is proleptic of the resurrection, has been the dominant theological understanding of the tradition.[2] The other major view is that the transfiguration is proleptic of the parousia.[3] It is worth noting that both sides agree that the significance of the transfiguration lies in pointing ahead to another event. Thus it is not surprising that the transfiguration narratives themselves have suffered a comparative neglect at the hands of students of the New Testament.[4]

---

[1] Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. John Marsh, rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 259. Bultmann's casual assurance ("it has long since been recognized that this legend was originally a resurrection story") generated an indignation that still echoes in the lecture-halls of Great Britian.

[2] See for a recent example James Robinson's comments in James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, Trajectories Through Early Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), pp. 48-49, and particularly p. 48, n. 43.

[3] The most recent example of this view--representing that of Norman Perrin--is to be found in Werner Kelber, The Kingdom in Mark (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974). The problem of "transfiguration proleptic of resurrection" and "transfiguration proleptic of parousia" is taken up again in chapter three of the present work.

[4] The most recent survey of the literature is now S. Gennarini, "Le principali interpretazioni postliberali della pericope della trasfigurazione di Gesu," Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa 8 (1972): 80-132.

XUM

The most important recent developments, in fact, have not been focussed upon the transfiguration itself, but have occurred in related fields. The first of these fields is the study of the θεῖος ἀνήρ. Mark 9:2-8, it has been claimed, could be the climax of a miracle-cycle depicting the deeds of Jesus as such a figure.[1] At this point it can only be said that the transfiguration has been claimed as such a climax. So far as I am aware, no parallels have been brought forward between Mark 9:2-8 and hellenistic accounts of the θεῖος ἀνήρ. Nor has it been established that there are no parallels.[2] Thus the precise relationship of the transfiguration to the θεῖος ἀνήρ-traditions is yet to be determined. We do not know whether Mark 9:2-8 is the decisive link between Mark's picture of Jesus and the hellenistic concept of the θεῖος ἀνήρ, or the decisive advance made by Mark, or his traditions, beyond that concept. Progress can be made here through tradition-historical research.

The second related field, and that related to our own approach to the transfiguration material, is redaction criticism of Mark. Norman Perrin has related Mark 9:2-8 to Mark's three-fold passion predictions. The reader, he claims, is led to stand between Jesus' resurrection and the

---

[1] Robinson, Trajectories, pp. 48-49; see also Theodore J. Weeden, Mark: Traditions in Conflict (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), pp. 118-21.

[2] Morton Smith, "The Aretalogy Used By Mark," in Protocol of the Sixth Colloquy of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture (Berkeley, Ca.: Graduate Theological Union and The University of California-Berkeley, 1974), p. 47. The whole work will repay careful study. A valuable short bibliography may be found on pp. 24-25.

XUM

parousia; the transfiguration prepares the reader for his own suffering as a disciple, by pointing to Jesus' victory at the parousia as a sign of hope.[1] This represents a decisive advance in understanding the transfiguration tradition in Mark's gospel. We are no longer starting with a tradition and searching for a Sitz-im-Leben, but understanding a tradition in light of its manifest use within a literary work. This has been developed by Perrin's student Werner Kelber, who devotes a chapter of his dissertation to establishing Mark 9:2-8 as proleptic of the parousia in Mark's gospel.[2] The ultimate goal is Mark 9:2-8 as a clue to Mark's theology. The decisive point is the determination to understand Mark's transfiguration account in light of Mark's gospel itself. This is the step which has yet to be taken, and which we want to take, with regard to Matthew.

It is notorious that the transfiguration accounts in Matthew and Luke--to say nothing of its omission in John, which is an important problem in itself--have been only the "poor relations" of Mark 9:2-8. This was to be expected so long as the transfiguration was approached through source criticism, history-of-religions research, or tradition history; for if one is trying to "get behind" a tradition one inevitably tackles its earliest expression.[3] But this is especially regrettable in

---

[1] Norman Perrin, "Towards an Interpretation of the Gospel of Mark" (University of Chicago Divinity School, n.d.).

[2] Kelber, Kingdom, pp. 49-87.

[3] We say here once for all that we accept the traditional view of synoptic relationships. While we are aware of the discussions being maintained by Farmer and Dungan--and particularly of the new directions being developed by Antonio Gaboury--we still regard these as hypotheses. For our own work we assume that Mark 9:2-8 is the source of Matthew 17:1-9.

XUM

connection with Matthew's account; for 17:1-9 is an important element in the development of one of Matthew's characteristic interests, the question of true discipleship, and is carefully integrated into the structure of his gospel as well.

Most scholars, however, have not shared Matthew's own interest in 17:1-9. Under the fascination of Mark 9:2-8 as the "original" account, even writers on Matthew have treated Matthew's transfiguration account merely as a bequeathal of the "tradition," without special importance for Matthew's own theology or for the structure of his gospel. It is symptomatic that the commentaries, for the most part, only point out the obvious differences from Mark 9:2-8. The important redactional works of the past two decades do not consider 17:1-9 in any detail;[1] and recent works, which tend to trace themes through the gospel as a whole, also overlook it.[2] It has, so far as I know, never been approached as an important datum for understanding Matthew's thought. We might expect more from the recent structural studies of the gospel--it was, after all, Perrin's structural work which led to his understanding of the theological significance of

---

[1] For example, the concept, the passage, and the Greek terminology are all missing from the indexes of Wolfgang Trilling, Das Wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums, 3rd ed., rev. (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1964). The passage is discussed occasionally--but to illustrate other points, not for its own intrinsic interest--in Georg Strecker, Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962). G. D. Kilpatrick, The Origins of The Gospel According to St. Matthew (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Clarendon Press, 1946), p. 51, gives attention in passing to 17:6f.

[2] See for example Robert H. Gundry, The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967); Douglas R. A. Hare, The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1967), in the index of which the pericope does not appear, is also typical.

XUM

Mark 9:2-8--but these too are disappointing.[1]

Our goal is to understand Matthew's transfiguration account in the light of his gospel as a whole. Such an understanding must meet, we believe, three criteria. The first is that it provide an explanation for Matthew's alterations from Mark 9:2-8. This is, of course, a bow in the direction of source criticism. Such a move has been opposed by some redaction critics on the ground that it does not respect the literary integrity of Matthew's work, which must be treated as a unity, irrespective of its sources.[2] Kelber himself approached Mark on "the level of the final unity of the gospel."[3] The difficulty, however, is not source criticism in itself but source criticism as an end in itself. If source criticism alone is used, our understanding of Matthew will be limited to those points at which he differs from Mark. But this is to deny the integrity of 17:1-9 as a literary unit; for if there is a Matthean "choice" to alter features of Mark's account, there must also be a choice to retain those features he does not alter, features which are equally important in 17:1-9 considered as a whole. This does not invalidate source criticism--Matthew's alterations may be just the clue to his reinterpretation of the Markan

---

[1] For example, Paul Gaechter, Das Matthäus Evangelium (Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1963), pp. 563-72. This commentary shows special sensitivity to literary and structural matters. But this does not inform the commentary itself on 17:1-9, which is quite traditional. In addition there is a disturbing tendency to harmonize the various synoptic accounts of the transfiguration. Thus the distinctive Matthean presentation--which structural analysis should bring out all the more--evaporates in the search for a "synoptic" or even a "New Testament" "view" of the transfiguration.

[2] Private communication from Professor H. Waetjen.

[3] Kelber, Kingdom, p. 5.

XUM

material he retains--but it reminds us that source criticism must not obscure the final unity of Matthew's own account as it stands.[1]

This leads to the second criterion: our understanding of Matthew's transfiguration account must provide a consistent and coherent picture of 17:1-9 as a whole. If Matthew is more than a compiler of motifs and traditions, then his account itself must provide a unity lacking among those diverse traditions present in 17:1-9. Furthermore, the unity must be demonstrated in two areas, literary as well as theological. It is not enough to show consistency of thought throughout 17:1-9; we must also trace the structural devices through which it is shaped into a whole. The ideal demonstration of the unity of 17:1-9--and, at the same time, of Matthew's creative activity--would reveal "theology" and "literary technique" as two sides of the same coin. This is the province of redaction criticism in the broadest sense, in which it is not merely an extension of tradition-history but includes the techniques of literary criticism and structural analysis as well.

With the third criterion we extend the focus from 17:1-9 to its context: our understanding of Matthew's transfiguration account must integrate it into Matthew's gospel as a whole. This is essential if we

---

[1] The discussion is similar to one carried on among students of the "original teaching" of Jesus. "Source criticism" in the above passage represents the claims of the so-called "criterion of dissimilarity," which is, according to one scholar, "the fundamental criterion for authenticity upon which all reconstructions of the teaching of Jesus must be built" (Norman Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus [New York: Harper & Row, 1967], pp. 39-43). The criterion states that that teaching is most likely to be original which is most dissimilar to teaching of the early church and ancient Judaism. It may be, as Perrin implies (Ibid., p. 43), that we simply cannot isolate the features of Jesus' teaching which this criterion obscures--those in which he is at one with his environment. But this does not change the fact that a complete account of his teaching would include those elements. Fortunately, we have 17:1-9 as a unit before us.

XUM

are to take Matthew seriously as the author of a book. If the evangelist demands his just recognition--alongside that faceless miracle known as "oral tradition"--then we expect the parts of his work to be consistent among themselves. Once again we must demonstrate both theological and literary aspects of this consistency. It is not enough to show that the thought of 17:1-9 is consistent with that of the gospel as a whole; we must also trace the structural devices through which it is integrated into the gospel. And, again, we must consider theological and structural coherence as expressions of the same creative activity. The ideal integration of 17:1-9 into the gospel would relate our specific theological understanding of the account, not only to Matthew's theology, but to the structure of his gospel as well.

With these three criteria established we may outline the course of our investigations. The first step is an appreciation of the "Matthean" quality of 17:1-9. This is pursued in chapter one. It begins with an isolation of distinctive features through the use of source criticism. This is complemented by a structural analysis of 17:1-9. Both theological and structural studies converge upon a single conclusion, that Matthew is concerned not with Jesus, nor with the disciples, but precisely with their interaction. The "Matthean" quality of 17:1-9 must be sought in its picture of the disciples in relationship with their Lord.

Chapter two turns to the task of integrating 17:1-9 into the gospel as a whole. It is an intensive investigation of one aspect of this integration, that of the setting of the transfiguration event upon a mountain. Our conclusion is that Matthew has made 17:1-9 part of a structural pattern

XUM

important in his gospel, a pattern of seven mountains upon which Jesus is revealed to Matthew's readers as the Lord. In addition we explore certain compositional techniques which are, perhaps, unique to Matthew.

Chapter three approaches 17:1-9 as a picture of the disciples in relationship with their Lord. Its first section is a theological study of the account from this point of view, which is illuminated by--and tested against--the understanding of discipleship presented elsewhere in Matthew's gospel. The main conclusions are two. The first is that Jesus' transfiguration is, for Matthew, proleptic neither of the resurrection nor the parousia, but of that glorious life in the Kingdom which awaits the true disciples _after_ the parousia and last judgment. The second is that the transfiguration, for Matthew, is the commissioning of the disciples for the world-wide mission to be inaugurated in 28:16-20.

The second section of chapter three returns to the task of integration. The theological understanding of 17:1-9 as a picture of the disciples in relationship with their Lord is related to the structure of the gospel as a whole. This coincides nicely with chapter two, for our conclusion is that Matthew develops, as a sub-pattern of the seven mountains, a pattern of five "mountains of discipleship," upon which Jesus is revealed to the disciples as Lord. Of these mountains the mount of transfiguration holds a central position. Each mountain is surveyed, with particular attention given to 28:16-20, which appears as the culmination not just of the gospel as a whole, but also of the themes of discipleship developed in 17:1-9. Thus for Matthew the transfiguration is not an isolated event in Jesus' life, but a decisive element in the continuing life of the disciples

XUM

within the world, and a foretaste of their life in the kingdom with the Lord.

We may mention one or two further points in conclusion. Conoisseurs of methodology will already have concluded--perhaps with trepidation--that this will be a thoroughly eclectic work. Although methodology as such is hardly of interest here, it is only fair to the reader that one indicate the division of labor among his tools. Source criticism and structural analysis, then, are used in the first chapter; structural analysis, literary criticism, and form criticism in the second; and a combination of redaction criticism, structural analysis, and common sense in the third.

If we may speak of making a "contribution," it lies in the following areas. This is first of all a study in Matthew's theology, specifically the theology of discipleship. It hopes also to extend our knowledge of Matthew's compositional techniques, particularly structural techniques. Perhaps, finally, it may serve in the resurrection of the transfiguration as a tradition worthy of serious study, especially in relation to the theology of the various evangelists.

We hope simply to illuminate and clarify a few aspects of Matthew's genius by discovering meanings and patterns present not only to ourselves, but to Matthew as well.

CHAPTER I

MATTHEW'S ACCOUNT OF THE TRANSFIGURATION

A Source-Critical and Structural Analysis of Matthew 17:1-9

To understand Matthew's transfiguration account we must begin with the text of 17:1-9 itself. We will proceed systematically through the account, establishing the text where there appears to be any doubt, and searching for the intention behind Matthew's alterations from Mark's narrative and his construction of 17:1-9 as a literary whole.

Matthew 17:1

καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ
παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς
τὸν Πέτρον
καὶ Ἰάκ. καὶ Ἰω. τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς
εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν
κατ' ἰδίαν.

Matthew follows Mark closely, but there are certain alterations. Mark's structure is neater in his parallel to Matthew 17:1a:

παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς
τὸν Πέτρον
καὶ τὸν Ἰάκ. καὶ Ἰωάννην

XUM

Matthew disturbs this by omitting the article before the names of the brothers and by adding the description of John as τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. There is some textual support for the article in Alexandrian (א), Western (D), and Caesarian (Θ) traditions. Matthew himself uses it at 4:18, 4:21, and 10:2, though admittedly these are different: Σίμωνα τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον -- Ἰάκ. τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ.... -- Ἰάκ. ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου. Thus the article belongs to the qualifying phrase, describing James as the son of Zebedee. It is Matthew's usual practise to identify the brothers with reference to their father (for example 4:21, 10:2, and especially 20:20 and 20:24, where they are not even named but are referred to simply as the "sons of Zebedee" and the "two brothers" respectively; see also 26:37 and 27:56). At 17:1 Matthew appears to have followed Mark in omitting the association with Zebedee.[1] He probably omitted the article along with the qualifying phrase, and we should follow Nestle's judgment that it does not belong in the text.

Matthew also opposes Mark in adding the description of John as the brother of James. This is the usual Matthean practise; the three references to this John (4:21, 10:2, 17:1) all describe him in connection with James the brother.[2] Mark is often content to refer to "James and

---

[1] In Mark the brothers appear more often not in connection with Zebedee (apart from him, Mark 1:29, 5:37, 9:2, 10:41, 13:3, 14:33; with him, 1:19, 3:17, 10:35). Mark emphasizes the names of the brothers, Matthew their relation to Zebedee. The contrast is clearly shown by a comparison of Mark 10:41 with Matthew 20:24.

[2] We are not here concerned with the historical significance--if any--of this. Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Matthäus, 3rd ed., rev. Werner Schmauch (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), p. 267, claims this indicates that John was less well-known to Matthew's community than were Peter and James.

John" (1:29, 9:2, 9:28, 10:41, 13:3, 14:33).

κατ' ἰδίαν is replaced with λίαν in D, Eus. This is to be rejected as an accommodation to Matthew 4:8. λίαν is very rare in the New Testament, and does not occur elsewhere in Matthew as an indication of physical height. κατ' ἰδίαν, however, is not uncommon in such contexts in Matthew (see for example 14:13, 14:21, 17:19, 10:17, and 24:3). It is noteworthy that D also alters Luke 4:5 to agree with the λίαν of Matthew 4:8.

Matthew's omission of μόνους at the end of 17:1 is curious from the structural point of view. In Mark μόνους forms a parallel with μόνον at 9:8, which Matthew retains in 17:8. Furthermore, μόνους is almost twice as frequent in Matthew as in Mark. The usual explanation is that Matthew is improving Mark's style by excising the redundant μόνους at the end of 17:1. There is no better explanation available; but if this is the reason, Matthew does so at the expense of structural considerations.

On the whole, then, Matthew seems more interested in following his own characteristic usage of words than in the structure of 17:1. He does follow Markan, rather than his own, usage in the treatment of the brothers, but this is certainly not from structural motives.

Matthew 17:2

καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν
καὶ ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ
ὡς ὁ ἥλιος
τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο λευκὰ
ὡς τὸ φῶς.

XUM

Matthew's differences from Mark are much more considerable here. He eliminates στίλβοντα (in the New Testament only at Mark 9:3) and Mark's curious phrase about the "fuller," together with the slightly more common λίαν . He adds the reference to Jesus' face, together with the motifs of the sun and light. The additions form a nicely balanced structure: the face shone "as the sun"; the garments were bright "as light." λάμπω is not used elsewhere in Matthew with reference to Jesus. It is associated with ἔμπροσθεν , and with φῶς , in 5:15-16, where Matthew is describing the radiant quality of the life of discipleship.[1] This may be related--though precisely how has yet to be determined!--to II Corinthians 4:6, which associates λάμπω with the πρόσωπον of Christ (though the primary point is God's internal illumination of the heart of the believer).

Matthew's use of πρόσωπον is also unique in the gospels. It is related most closely to another passage in II Corinthians, 3:7-18. In contrast to the Exodus accounts of Moses' ascents of Sinai, in which only Moses' face shines, II Corinthians 3:18 seems to indicate that the faces of all the believers will "shine" in glory, even in the present age. This is not directly related to Matthew's transfiguration account, but it may be related to Luke's through the use of the term δόξα (II Corinthians 3:18 and Luke 9:31).[2]

---

[1] Many of the terms discussed here from a source-critical viewpoint are also important for an understanding of Matthew's theology as developed in the transfiguration account. On this see chapter three, below.

[2] On the relation of the synoptic transfiguration accounts to the picture in II Corinthians 3:18 see above all Dieter Georgi, Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964). The principal discussion begins on page 215.

XUM

ὁ ἥλιος is rare in Matthew's gospel. It may draw attention to the world of everyday affairs within which the disciple lives, or refer to the world of apocalyptic (see 5:45, 13:6, and 24:29 respectively). The most important Matthean parallel--and one that will be decisive for our theological treatment of 17:1-9 in chapter three--is found in 13:43: τότε οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμψουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν. The motif may also be illustrated from Revelation 10:1. There is again no suggestion in Matthew's transfiguration account that the transformation of the believers is a matter of the present time, as in II Corinthians 3:18.

All three synoptics refer to the change in Jesus' garments. Matthew's description is unique. He uses φῶς elsewhere in apocalyptic contexts (10:27), and in wisdom traditions (5:14, 5:16, 6:23) and in a citation of Isaiah 9:1 (4:16). The expression ὡς τὸ φῶς is rather awkward--light may be said to illuminate colors, but it is not itself a color. Indeed it is difficult to find a proper parallel to ὡς τὸ φῶς. Perhaps this difficulty in part accounts for the variant χιών found in D lat sy^{c} bo^{pt}; Cyr (Epiph). This is essentially a Western reading, although the coptic text gives some Alexandrian support as well. The word is used only twice in the New Testament, at Revelation 1:14 and Matthew 28:3; the present variant is probably an assimilation to the latter text, which incorporates both λευκός and a mention of the clothing. (It is interesting that Nestle cites more support for the variant in connection with Mark 9:3, specifically k Dpl lat sy). In any case, there are sufficient parallels--for example, Isaiah 1:18, Psalm 51:7, Ethiopic

XUM

Enoch 106:2, 106:10--to make this a natural gloss, and to retain φῶς as the more difficult reading.[1]

Now if we examine 17:2 we find that it presents a nicely-formed structure. There is a description of Jesus' transformation (καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν), which is then specified in terms of two of its effects (καὶ ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ and τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο λευκά), each of which is defined by a ὡς -phrase (ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, ὡς τὸ φῶς). The contrast with 17:1 is illuminating. While 17:1 showed little concern for structure, 17:2 displays a well-developed structure. And this corresponds with the degree of Matthean activity visible. For of the 25 words in 17:1, at least 20 are taken from Mark; but of the 21 words in 17:2, only 9 come from Mark. Thus it is precisely where Matthew develops his own material that he shows the greatest concern with the structure of the passage.

Matthew 17:3

καὶ ἰδοὺ
  ὤφθη αὐτοῖς
    Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἠλίας
      συλλαλοῦντες μετ' αὐτοῦ.

Matthew's text appears similar to that of Mark; but, again, there are some important differences. The first is the addition of ἰδοὺ, which he shares with Luke 9:30. ἰδοὺ is much more frequent in

---

[1] Alan H. M'Neile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Macmillan & Co., 1952), p. 249, supports this opinion.

Matthew's gospel than in Mark's (some 62 uses against only 8). Mark always uses the term in speech (for example at 3:32, 4:3, 10:28, and 10:33), with the speaker introducing an event of unusual significance. Matthew shares this usage in passages such as 10:16, 12:46, 26:46, and 28:7; in addition, he uses the term as a narrative feature, with the evangelist himself acting as "speaker" and introducing the significant event (for example, 20:30, 27:51, 28:2, 9:20, 12:10, 26:47). Luke does not use ἰδού again in the transfiguration scene, and Mark not at all. This makes Matthew's three-fold usage (17:3, and twice in 17:5) all the more striking. It seems to be another example of the evangelist himself as "speaker" introducing the significant event. Indeed, since 17:4 and 17:6-7 are devoted to the disciples' reactions to the events upon the mountain, it appears that ἰδού is used to introduce all the "supernatural" or miraculous elements in Matthew's transfiguration account. The only exception is the transformation itself in 17:2.[1]

The alteration of Mark's order to read "Moses and Elijah" is consistent with Matthew's interest in Moses throughout his gospel. Those who say that Matthew "corrects" Mark at this point are operating from a hidden agenda.[2] Mark's order is entirely correct in his own terms--he does seem to be more interested in Elijah than in Moses--and he may even have

---

[1] Lohmeyer, Evangelium, p. 267, draws attention to the use of ἰδού in connection with the three supernatural events, but does not point out that it signals all such events--except the transformation--in 17:1-9.

[2] For example, W. C. Allen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1951), ad loc.

XUM

been thinking of the Septuagint order of Malachi 4:4-6, according to which Elijah preceedes Moses.[1]

Matthew omits ἦσαν in 17:3b. According to Moulton this is in keeping with his customary usage.[2]

Matthew 17:4

ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ
ὁ Πέτρος
εἶπεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ·
κύριε,
{ καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι·
{ εἰ θέλεις,
ποιήσω ὧδε τρεῖς σκηνάς,
{ σοὶ μίαν
{ καὶ Μωϋσεῖ μίαν
{ καὶ Ἠλίᾳ μίαν.

---

[1] Noticed by M'Neile, Gospel, p. 249; see also R. H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Galaxy Books, 1962), p. 116, n., and D. E. Nineham, The Gospel of Saint Mark, Pelican Gospel Commentaries (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1963), pp. 234-35. The point had already been noticed by St. Augustine. On Mark's transfiguration story see also A. Feuillet, "Les perspectives propres à chaque évangéliste dans les récits de la transfiguration," Biblica 39 (1958): 283ff.

[2] John H. Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, vol. 2: Accidence and Word-Formation, ed. W. F. Howard (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929), p. 452. He gives as examples of Matthew's using the imperfect of εἰμι with the present participle 8:30 and 19:22 (cf. 7:20, 27:55). The point is the rarity of such passages in Matthew when parallel Markan passages have the construction. The usage does seem to conform to Matthew's "customary usage" of tightening up Mark's parataxis by means of subordination. For this information I am indebted to Father Thomas Leahy, S. J., whose private communication I have quoted at certain points above.

XUM

Again Matthew shows a combination of similarity and difference with respect to Mark. Each evangelist uses his own term of address. As we will see in chapter three, Mark's term, ῥαββί , has a negative connotation for Matthew. At 23:7-8 he explicitly denies that the term is suitable for use among Jesus' followers; its use in the Pharisees' communities is a mark of their pride (compare Mark 12:37b-40 and Luke 20:45-47, which are both different). Matthew 26:25 and 26:49 show Jesus addressed as ῥαββί , but by Judas in betraying him. The second of these is paralleled in Mark (14:45), but not the first (compare Mark 14:21 and Luke 22:22). Thus Matthew has linked the prediction and the fulfillment through the usage of ῥαββί .

The use of κύριε , on the other hand, is characteristic of Matthew.[1] It is used in the vocative only twice in Mark (7:28 and 10:51, where the text is much disputed). For Matthew it usually applies to Jesus, in scenes of healing (8:2, 8:6, 8:8, 8:21, 8:25, 9:28, 15:22, 15:25, 15:27, 17:15, 20:30, 20:31, 20:33) and in miracles (14:28, 14:30), and in contexts treating discipleship, whether through parables (25:11, 25:20, 25:22, 25:24, and elsewhere) or in discussion with Jesus (7:21, 7:22, 16:22, 18:21). Once Jesus uses the term in addressing God (11:25). Generally speaking, the term belongs to the circle of Jesus and his followers. The one usage by the "Jews" is ironic: they are speaking to Pilate![2]

Matthew's addition of εἰ θέλεις is also consistent with

---

[1] But see our discussion of this title in chapter three!

[2] 27:63.

XUM

the gospel as a whole. He employs the phrase some 10 times, in contexts of discipleship (16:24, 16:25, 19:17, 19:21, 20:26, 20:27), with reference to God's intentions (27:43), and in direct speech to Jesus (17:4, 8:2). It is also used in the striking challenge to the crowd in 11:14: καὶ εἰ θέλετε δέξασθαι, αὐτός ἐστιν Ἠλίας ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι. Whether Matthew's purpose in 17:4 is to save face on behalf of the disciples, we will consider later on. (The same applies to the omission of the material in Mark 9:6).[1]

Matthew differs from both Mark and Luke in using the singular ποιήσω. There is widespread textual support for the plural form found in the other gospels (kDWΘ(1)ϕpm it sy$^{c.p}$ sa bo). The singular is probably correct. The plural would be an obvious harmonization, and certainly the easier reading. Furthermore, the singular is in keeping with Peter's role in Matthew, for example in 16:13-20 where, as at 17:4, Matthew emphasizes that it is Peter--and not all the disciples--who speak. Peter is not merely the representative spokesman for all the disciples in these passages, but a figure in his own right.

For the most part Matthew's differences from Mark in Matthew 17:4 are not structurally significant. The replacement of ῥαββί by κύριε does not affect the structure of the passage, nor does the use of ποιήσω rather than ποιήσωμεν. The long omission of Mark 9:6 material

---

[1] The theological basis for this "saving face" would be along the lines of Gerhard Barth's comment: "Whereas in Mark the disciples remain completely devoid of understanding until the resurrection of Jesus . . . in Matthew understanding is already granted to them," in Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, trans. Percy Scott (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), p. 109. On Peter see now Raymond E. Brown, Karl P. Donfried, eds., Peter in the New Testament (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, and New York: Paulist Press, 1973).

XUM

does deprive Matthew 17:4 of a statement at the end of the unit, to balance the mention of ὁ Πέτρος at the beginning. Apparently Matthew judged this less important than other considerations. This is consistent with our investigation of 17:1-3 above.

Matthew 17:5

ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος
ἰδοὺ νεφέλη φωτεινὴ
ἐπισκίασεν αὐτούς,
καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης
λέγουσα·
οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου
ὁ ἀγαπητός,
ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα·
ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

All the synoptics stress the suddenness of the appearance of the cloud. Mark does so by a characteristic καὶ ἐγένετο ; it is the simple and direct statement itself which indicates the sudden appearance. Luke and Matthew, however, feel the need to "verbalize" the striking quality of the timing of the event. Again, Matthew's language is consistent with his usage elsewhere. Luke uses the phrase ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος twice (8:49, also Mark; 22:47, also Mark and Matthew). Mark also uses it twice (5:35, not in Matthew; but cf. Luke 8:49--also 14:43, in Matthew and Luke also). Matthew uses the phrase three times. It appears in the passion tradition and is a feature of synoptic tradition (26:47=Mark 14:43=Luke 22:47). The other two uses are unique to Matthew. In addition to 17:5 there is 12:46

(omitted at Mark 3:31 and Luke 8:19). In each case the next phrase begins with ἰδού ; Matthew retains the pattern at 17:5, where he is the only writer to use the word. In 26:47 and 17:5 the connection of ἰδού to the context is obvious. 12:46 appears to take a different tack from the verses which precede it.[1] But Matthew may have intended a connection here too. The last subject in 12:45, γενεᾷ , clearly means "generation," but the word can also mean "family." Thus it might be a pun linking 12:45 to the discussion of Jesus' "family" in the following verses 12:46-50.

Matthew's description of the cloud as φωτεινή is unique. He uses the word only once more, in the wisdom material of 6:22 (cf. Luke 11:34, 11:36). The word is of no structural significance in 17:5; its theological importance will be considered in chapter three. Here we note only that it forms another connection to II Corinthians 4:4-6, where the term φωτισμός is used.[2]

The addition of ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα to the voice from the cloud is universally understood as an echo of the voice at the baptism in 3:17. All the synoptics include this feature in their baptism accounts, though Mark and Luke render it as ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα . Mark does not use εὐδοκέω again. Luke adds it in 12:32, where it contrasts with Matthew 6:34. Again it is Matthew who most often uses this rare word.

---

[1] Both RSV and the Nestle Greek text begin a new paragraph here. Even the structural specialist Gaechter, *Matthäus*, p. 421, says that 12:46 "ist ohne Beziehung zum vorausgehenden Text." Bernhard Weiss, *Das Matthäus-Evangelium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898), pp. 304-06, does mention the connection of 17:5 with 12:46, but does not, I believe, consider its relationship to 26:49.

[2] The theme of light remains important in later New Testament works; see for example Hebrews 6:4 and 10:32.

He makes 3:17 identical with 17:5, and in addition quotes Isaiah 42:1 at 12:18, again applying the phrase to Jesus. If the immediate reason for the quotation in 12:18 was the reference to secrecy (for 12:19 picks up 12:16, the command to silence), then 12:18ff. also relates to the sequel to the transfiguration account, 17:10-13, in which Jesus commands "silence" until the Son of Man "is raised from the dead." Finally, the double reference to the "nations" in 12:18 and 12:21 is echoed in the commissioning scene[1] of 28:16-20, which, as we shall see later, is intimately related to Matthew's account of the transfiguration. The link is strengthened by the appearance of ὄνομα in both 12:21 and 28:19. Thus Matthew does not merely quote the "synoptic" tradition with regard to the voice at the baptism event. He is weaving a fabric of interrelated themes throughout his gospel--a fabric we must try to unravel when we consider the theology of the account in 17:1-9.

Each of the additions to 17:5 which we have discussed has its own rationale. ἰδού is significant structurally in the transfiguration accounts in Matthew; in addition, we have seen its larger context, the phrase ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος . . . ἰδού, is also characteristic of Matthew. ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα, however, is not structurally significant; indeed it spoils the balance of the phrase ὁ υἱός μου/ ὁ ἀγαπητός. But the phrase is important in Matthew's gospel as a whole, as we see from its use in 3:17 and 12:18. The term φωτεινή has no structural significance, nor is it typical of Matthean usage, but may be important for the theological understanding of the passage. To summarize, there appears to be no single, neat pattern to Matthew's development of 17:5. This seems motivated by a combination of structural, linguistic, and theological considerations.

---

[1] So-called! But see the discussion in chapter three.

Matthew 17:6-7

καὶ ἀκούσαντες,
οἱ μαθηταὶ
ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν
καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα.

καὶ προσῆλθεν
ὁ Ἰησοῦς
καὶ ἁψάμενος αὐτῶν
εἶπεν·
ἐγέρθητε
καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε

Both verses belong exclusively to Matthew. They reveal a parallel structure throughout. Thus καὶ ἀκούσαντες corresponds to καὶ προσῆλθεν, οἱ μαθηταὶ to ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν to ἐγέρθητε, and καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα to καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε. The only feature in 17:7 which stands outside this structure is the description of Jesus' activity, καὶ ἁψάμενος αὐτῶν.

Matthew's reference to the "disciples" in 17:6 is striking; usually this means a larger group.[1] It may be one of indefinite size, as

---

[1] See Ernest Martinez, "The Interpretation of οἱ μαθηταί in Matthew 18," CBQ 23 (1961): 281-92.

XUM

at 5:1, 8:21, or specifically the "twelve disciples" as at 10:1, 11:1, 26:20, 20:17 (and presumably also 21:20, and perhaps in the background at 24:3), or the "twelve" minus Judas as at 28:16. But Matthew does use the term "disciples" to refer to smaller groups of them, as at 17:10, 17:13, and possibly 17:16. If we now compare Matthew's other such uses with the other synoptics, an interesting pattern emerges. In 21:21 we have δύο μαθητάς . Both Mark and Luke employ the genitive phrase δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ (Mark 11:1, Luke 19:29). At 21:6 Matthew has οἱ μαθηταὶ --referring to the two of 21:1--, Mark simply καὶ ἀπῆλθον (11:4) and Luke οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι (19:32). Matthew 26:36-37 uses τοῖς μαθηταῖς ; the three disciples merge into the total group as the scene progresses (cf. 26:40, 26:45, and 26:56). Matthew appears to refer to them as "disciples" (μαθηταί) whenever the occasion presents itself, while Mark and Luke are quite content to use verbal phrases which identify them in the context of a particular event. Matthew emphasizes their "identity" as disciples.

The description of the disciples' reaction (17:6) is particularly interesting. Matthew uses πίπτω , apart from mundane instances such as 13:4-5, 13:7-8, and 17:15, in two characteristic ways. The more frequent is in connection with προσκυνέω . This indicates worship at 2:11, 26:39, and (ironically) 4:9, and a reduced meaning, such as "imploring," at 18:26 and 18:29. The other usage indicates worship without employing the verb προσκυνέω . Here πίπτω occurs with ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον as at 17:6 and 26:39. These are the only two instances of this usage; thus Matthew's transfiguration account is

XUM

linked particularly to the scene in Gethsemane, and generally to the scenes in which the disciples worship Jesus in the gospel.

The connection with Gesthemane is strengthened through the use of πρόσωπον. The term is more frequent in Matthew than in Mark; and of Matthew's 10 uses, three refer to Jesus' face (17:2, 26:39, 26:67). The first and last of these three refer to Jesus' glorification and humiliation respectively. The only use of πρόσωπον in connection with the disciples (17:6) appears to link them to the fate of their Lord. The contrast between the transfiguration account and the events in Gesthemane is probably ironic; they are clearly "on their faces" in Gesthemane--but in sleep rather than worship (26:40).

φοβέομαι is used some 18 times in Matthew. It refers to the "fear" of the crowds (14:15, 21:26, 21:46), and appears in discussions of discipleship (10:26, 10:28, 10:31, 25:25). The usage often indicates the reaction to a supernatural or miraculous event, sometimes including worship as at 9:8, 27:54, and 28:9-10 (cf. 28:5). There are only two instances detailing such a reaction of the disciples to Jesus (14:27 and 17:6). The connection between the transfiguration in Matthew and Peter's walking upon the water will be examined later.

φοβέομαι is intensified through the use of σφόδρα. This is definitely a Matthean term; he uses it 7 times, as against only 4 for the rest of the New Testament. With one exception (18:31, parabolic), it denotes a reaction to Jesus' deed or presence (2:10, 17:23, 19:25, 26:22, 17:6, 27:54). It is used with φοβέομαι only once more, describing the reaction of the centurion and his companions to Jesus' death and the

XUM

subsequent earthquake (27:54).

προσέρχομαι is also a characteristic Matthean word, far more common in the first gospel than in the rest of the New Testament. It is used in most of the events occurring upon mountains (on which see chapter two), for example at 4:3, 4:11, 5:1, 17:7, 15:29, 24:3, and 28:18. Occasionally it appears in a context of worship (8:2, 28:9, probably also 9:18). It is striking that in the transfiguration account Jesus approaches the disciples, and not vice versa. There is some evidence that Matthew develops the combination of προσέρχομαι with the ἐγείρω which follows in 17:7. The same combination appears in 8:25 and 9:18-19, and, in reverse order, in 28:7-9.[1]

ἅπτομαι is used less often in Matthew than in Mark and Luke (9 times against 11 and 13 respectively), but the use here has a distinctive look. The usual usage is in healing narratives (Matthew 8:3=Mark 1:41= Luke 5:13, Matthew 14:36=Mark 6:56). Mark and Luke show other uses as well, such as the active sense "to kindle" (Luke 8:16, 11:33, 15:8, Acts 28:2) and Mark's instance of Jesus "touching" the little children (10:13; see also Luke 18:15). Matthew does not have the sense "kindle," and he describes the incident with the children in other terms (19:13-15). Every instance save one in Matthew belongs to the terminology of healing; the sole exception is the transfiguration account. We will consider its theological significance in some detail in chapter three.

---

[1] προσέρχομαι is also followed by ἐγείρω in two other places. ἐγείρω appears in the second and third passion predictions (17:23-24 and 20:19-20), each of which is followed by narratives including the term προσέρχομαι. In any case the picture is clear in Matthew of Jesus as one who "comes," and occasionally in connection with ἐγείρω.

Matthew's rather frequent use of ἐγείρω, moreover, may conceal the distinctive quality of the term in 17:7. In some 36 uses of ἐγείρω this is the only one in which it appears in the aorist passive imperative. Matthew does not define the disciples' condition, from which they are urged to "rise." Luke suggests that they are asleep (9:32), and there are Matthean uses of ἐγείρω in this connection. In 8:25-26 he employs the aorist, once in the indicative and once in the participial form. In 26:46 he does use the imperative, but the present (as does Mark 14:42). This instance strengthens our suspicion that the variant of 17:7 in D (ἐγείρεσθε) is an effort to regularize Matthew's terminology. As we have seen, ἐγείρω is associated with "rising" from the dead. The common expression in Matthew is ἐκ νεκρῶν or ἀπὸ νεκρῶν, where he employs the aorist indicative (14:2, 27:64, 28:6-7). He twice uses νεκρούς (νεκροί), with the present of ἐγείρω (at 10:8 and 11:5). The three passion predictions (16:21, 17:23, and 20:19) use infinitive and indicative forms. Thus the common appearance of the verb in Matthew makes the use in 17:7 all the more distinctive.[1]

The second part of Jesus' statement to the disciples, μὴ φοβεῖσθε, is consistent with Matthean usage. The negative μή is used in 8 of 18 instances of φοβέομαι, as against only 2 instances of 12 in Mark. The phrase μὴ φοβέομαι is reserved in Matthew for divine beings: it is spoken by the angel (1:20, 28:5) and by Jesus (10:26, 10:28, 10:31, 14:27, 17:7, 28:10). The usage in 17:7 is typical; the form

---

[1] It is notoriously difficult, and dangerous, to derive theology from grammatical usage. Nevertheless one cannot help speculating about the form used in 17:7 as an expression of Jesus' Lordly action upon the disciples.

XUM

φοβηθῆτε appears at 10:26 and 10:28.

This completes our survey of 17:6-7. These verses are Matthew's most extensive contribution to the transfiguration account. They bear out our previous impression that Matthew tends to embody more extensive additions to the narrative in a balanced, even polished literary form. This is the contribution of our examination of the structure of 17:6-7. They also bear out the impression that the additions are consistent with usage elsewhere in the gospel--in other words, that we are correct in speaking of them as "Matthew's additions." Kilpatrick notes that σφόδρα, προσέρχομαι, φοβεῖσθαι, and ἐγείρω are Matthean words;[1] we have already seen that at least the first three of these, and also οἱ μαθηταί, πίπτω, and ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, are consistent with Matthean usage. But there are also some inconsistent and unusual uses in Matthew's additions. We find the only use of πρόσωπον to refer to the disciples, and an unusual use of ἅπτομαι, and the unusual grammar of a familiar word, ἐγείρω. It is impossible to determine from structural considerations whether these unusual usages do represent non-Matthean features, incorporated perhaps even after the composition of the gospel as a whole, or whether Matthew himself is simply using them according to the demands of his unusual subject-matter. For while two of the unusual usages, πρόσωπον and ἐγέρθητε, occur in elements of 17:6-7 which are parallel in its structure as presented on page 25, the third, ἅπτομαι,

---

[1] Kilpatrick, Origins, p. 51.

XUM

occurs in the only part of 17:7 which does not have a parallel in 17:6. Whether these elements too are Matthew's own contribution will depend upon their consistency with the overall theology of 17:1-9 and of the gospel.

Matthew 17:8

ἐπάραντες δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν
οὐδένα εἶδον
εἰ μὴ αὐτὸν
Ἰησοῦν
μονον.

Matthew replaces Mark's καὶ ἐξάπινα περιβλεψάμενοι (9:8) with his own phrase. ἐξάπινα is used only here in the New Testament; indeed D Θ 0131 pc have replaced it with the Lucan term εὐθέως. περιβλέπω is a distinctive Markan term, appearing 6 times in Mark and only once more in the New Testament (Luke 6:10, probably under the influence of Mark 3:5). Matthew's own phrase, however, is hardly less unusual. ἐπαίρω occurs only here in Matthew and, while it is fairly common in Luke-Acts, it does not appear in the Lukan parallel to 17:8. Furthermore, there appears to be no parallel in Matthew to the use of ὀφθαλμός here.[1]

The rest of the verse presents only small changes from Mark. Matthew omits οὐκέτι (restored in p) C); this is consistent with the extreme rarity of the term in Matthew (only at 19:6 and 22:46, the first reflecting Mark 10:8). The traditional explanation for such omissions is Matthew's supposed desire to "improve" Mark's style through the removal of a redundant expression. Such judgments are questionable--one might equally say that the μόνον which Matthew retains is redundant on purely stylistic grounds (the real reason for its retention is the desire to intensify the picture of Jesus as the sole object visible to the disciples at the conclusion of the scene).[1]

---

[1] Weiss, Matthäus-Evangelium, p. 306, saw a parallel to John 4:35, 6:5.

Matthew's addition of αὐτόν is more interesting. He uses Ἰησοῦς without the article only 18 times, and only twice more with the pronoun αὐτόν, both times in the genitive phrase καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν (1:21, 1:25). Probably for this reason the word is omitted in W and changed to the article in C k (ʃ D)1 ϕ pl. The text is supported by B* (ʃ ℵ) Θ pc. This is clearly the more difficult reading, and should be retained.[2] The meaning is probably emphatic, as if, returning to the traditional account after his interpolation of 17:6-7, Matthew were saying, "then they saw only Jesus, the very one whom they had feared, and who had touched them."

The omission of μεθ' ἑαυτῶν is difficult to account for. Matthew does use this phrase (12:45, where it is not found in the parallel

---

[1] Perhaps the omission of οὐκέτι is to be explained along similar lines. The effect of οὐκέτι is really to draw attention to the previous time, which is now "no longer" present. Thus Mark 9:8 looks back to the presence of Moses and Elijah even as it proclaims the sole presence of Jesus. But the look back is precisely what Matthew wants to avoid; everything is directed forward, to the Jesus who is sole Lord of the disciples.

[2] Julius Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Matthaei (Berlin: Reimer, 1904), p. 87, read αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν without μόνον, as the equivalent of an original Aramaic leh l'Jeschu.

XUM

text Luke 11:26, 25:3, without parallel, and 26:11, which is similar to Mark 14:7). Its omission is puzzling on structural grounds, for it would have provided a balance to the αὐτῶν at the end of the first phrase of 17:8. The omission may be due to the effect Matthew was trying to create. The final three elements of 17:8, εἰ μὴ αὐτόν, Ἰησοῦν, and μόνον, all emphasize the lone figure, Jesus, who now appears to the disciples. Matthew may have felt that the addition of the μεθ' ἑαυτῶν would have distracted from this impression, by shifting our attention once again to the disciples themselves rather than the object of their gaze.

Matthew 17:9

{ καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν
{ ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους
ἐνετείλατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων·
{ μηδενὶ εἴπητε τὸ ὅραμα
{ { ἕως οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθ.
{ { ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθῇ.

There is some question whether 17:9 belongs to the preceding transfiguration material or to the Elijah-traditions which follow in 17:10-13. M'Neile treats 17:9 with the following material, as does Lohmeyer; Taylor in his commentary on Mark does the same for that account. Michaelis and Gaechter consider the unit to consist of 17:1-9. In general these choices are not explained in any detail. The obvious reason for including 17:9 with 17:10-13 is content: the phrase ἕως οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθῇ leads into the discussion of when Elijah is to

XUM

come in 17:10-13. We have adopted a more literary approach. There is a clear structural parallel between 17:1 and 17:9:

ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν
καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους

which has its counterpart in the only other mountain scene in Matthew in which a "descent" is mentioned, that is, 5:1 and 8:1:

ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος
καταβάντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους

In both cases the references to ascent and descent of the mountains serve as a literary "frame" for the scenes.[1] This clearly links 17:9 to 17:1; but it is impossible to overlook the connection of content which links 17:9 to 17:10-13 as well. To do justice to Matthew we must recognize a double intention in 17:9; it belongs structurally with 17:1-8 and by its content prepares the way for the discussion of 17:10-13.

The expression ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους, shared by Matthew and Mark, is unusual. Indeed Lohmeyer refers to the "fast unmögliche ἐκ."[2] And it is the only such use of the word in either Matthew or Mark. Matthew himself uses the much more common phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους to describe the descent at 8:1. There is strong support for ἀπό at Mark 9:9 (h K A N W Γ Δ Θ Π φ pl), but Nestle follows B D Ψ pc in retaining ἐκ. This is to be preferred as the more difficult reading. A glance at the lexicon shows that it is by no means impossible. Bauer cites parallels to ἐκ from

---

[1] On this see chapter two.

[2] Lohmeyer, Evangelium, p. 269.

Il. 13.17, Xenophon, An. 7. 4. 12, Exodus 19:14, 32:1, Deuteronomy 9:15, 10:5, and Joshua 2:23. The parallels from Exodus and Deuteronomy are of special interest in light of the probable parallelism between Jesus and Moses in the transfiguration accounts.[1] The term of descent in these usages is κατέβη ἐκ , except at Exodus 32:1 which employs καταβῆναι. One important parallel is not noted in Bauer: Rahlfs adopts the reading ὡς δὲ κατέβαινεν Μ. ἐκ at Exodus 34:29, describing Moses' descent from Sinai armed with the tables of the law.

Matthew replaces Mark's διεστείλατο with the term ἐνετείλατο. Mark himself uses διαστέλλομαι 5 of the 8 times it appears in the New Testament. Matthew's only use is in 16:20, if we follow ℵ C K W Θ pl (Aland follows p) B D e sy^c in reading ἐπετίμησεν.) ἐντέλλομαι is used 4 or 5 times in Matthew in connection with the magisterial lawgiver, whether God, Moses, or now Jesus (4:6, a quotation from Psalm 91:11-12, 19:7, 17:9, and 28:20). Another usage is attested at 15:4 by ℵ C K pm; but Aland follows B ℵ^{corr} D Θ 700 al lat sy sa bo; Ir in reading εἶπεν . The combination of ἐντέλλομαι with λέγων appears in 17:9 and the disputed 15:4. In view of the rarity of the term, its use in 17:9 is clearly a link to 28:20 and, possibly, 15:4, though the uncertainty concerning the text makes it impossible to be sure about Matthew's intention there.

Matthew adds ὁ Ἰησοῦς to 17:9. This occurs also at 8:4, where the mention of Jesus' name is also omitted from Mark (1:44), and where we find the motif of secrecy as well. It is pointless to dogmatize about the reason for Matthew's addition. It probably is intended to perform several functions. Certainly it emphasizes once again the presence of Jesus with the disciples; it also provides a parallel to the mention of Jesus in 17:1, thus reinforcing 17:1 and 17:9 as forming a literary "frame" around the transfiguration scene. The use also strengthens the association of Jesus with the "son of man" title which appears later in this verse.[1]

---

[1] But this must be understood in connection with Elijah as well. On this see chapter three.

Matthew's use of τὸ ὅραμα rather than the ἃ εἶδον of Mark is striking. There are 11 other uses of ὅραμα in the New Testament; they all belong to the book of Acts, and several occur at critical points in the expansion of the faith. We must examine the theological significance of Matthew's use of ὅραμα at some length in chapter three.

The use of ἕως οὗ in place of Mark's εἰ μὴ ὅταν is consistent with the gospel as a whole. Matthew never uses Mark's phrase, but ἕως οὗ occurs five more times, and once in connection with Gethsemane. ἕως is used in connection with the future coming of the υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου at 10:23 and 16:28 as well as 17:9.

At the conclusion of 17:9 Matthew replaces Mark's ἀναστῇ with the term ἐγερθῇ. We have already mentioned the importance of this in 17:7. The use of ἐγείρω instead of ἀνίστημι is standard procedure for Matthew;[2] his regular contrast with Mark at this point is best seen through a comparison of the three passion predictions:

---

[1] Matthew develops a special connection between the transfiguration event and the son of man traditions. On this see chapter three.

[2] See John Langfitt, "ἀνίστημι in Early Christian Tradition" (Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1973), on usage of ἀνίστημι.

XUM

(1) Matthew 16:21 καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι
Mark 8:31 καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι

(2) Matthew 17:23 καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται
Mark 9:31 καὶ... μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται

(3) Matthew 20:19 καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται
Mark 10:34 καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται

Matthew has no parallel to Mark 9:10. Probably he considered it superfluous in light of 17:10-13. He does not use κρατέω in connection with Jesus' teaching, although he does employ the word 12 times. Mark's συζητέω is not used at all in Matthew's gospel. Perhaps another clue to the omission of Mark 9:10 is Mark's description of Jesus' statement in 9:9 as τὸν λόγον. Mark uses the term λόγος to refer both to teaching in general, or to the message as a whole (2:2, 4:14, 4:33, 8:38, 12:13, 13:31, 14:39), and to refer to a specific teaching just given by Jesus (8:32, 9:10, 10:22, 10:24). Matthew uses λόγος more often in the first sense (5:37, 8:8, 8:16, 10:14, 12:32, 12:36, 12:37, 13:19-23, 15:6, 15:23, 22:15, 22:46, 24:35, 26:44), but there are examples of the second as well (7:28, 19:1, 26:1--all concluding their "discourses"--, 15:12, 19:11, 19:22). Michaelis points out that in 17:9 Matthew has taken material in indirect speech in Mark (as he also does in Matthew 15:15, 15:22, 15:25, 16:22, 18:1, and elsewhere) and made it into a "word of Jesus," as he also does in 26:1 and 26:27.[1] This is correct with respect to Matthew. It appears that Mark himself understood 9:9 as such a "word of Jesus" and made it explicit through the use of λόγος at the beginning of 9:10. Matthew would then have omitted this, feeling that he had already made the point through the use of the phrase ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων in 17:9.

---

[1] Wilhelm Michaelis, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, 2 vols. (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1948), 2: 387.

This concludes our source-critical and structural survey of Matthew's transfiguration account. The following table attempts to summarize this account in light of our investigation. "Matthean features" means Matthean "with respect to Mark"--in other words, features in which Matthew and Mark differ. Most of them are, of course, additions with respect to Mark's account; features present in Mark but not in Matthew are indicated by a minus sign (-). We attempt to distinguish, on the basis of our previous discussion, between features "typical" of Matthew's usage and those more or less "atypical" when seen in light of his gospel as a whole. There is also an effort to assess the structural effect of the various alterations from Mark's account.

Verse	Matthean features: words typical of Matthew's usage	Matthean features: words atypical of Matthew's usage	Effect on structure
17:1	τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ	τόν, μόνους (-)	possibly negative
17:2	στιλβοντα (-) γναφεύς (-) λίαν (-)	λαμπω, ἥλιος ὡς τὸ φῶς πρόσωπον	forms good structure
17:3	Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἡλίας ἦσαν (-)	ἰδού	unclear
17:4	κύριος, εἰ θέλεις ποιήσω, ῥαββί(-)	οὐ γὰρ...(-) ἀποκριθῇ (-)	somewhat negative

17:5	ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος εὐδοκέω ἰδού	φωτεινή	generally negative; ἰδού is positive
17:6	οἱ μαθηταί σφόδρα,	πίπτω, φοβέομαι, πρόσωπον	forms good structure
17:7	προσέρχομαι, ἐγείρω(?), μὴ φοβεῖσθε	ἅπτω, ἐγείρω(?)	
17:8	οὐκέτι (-)	μεθ' ἑαυτῶν (-), ἐπαίρω, ὀφθαλμός, αὐτον	structure unclear
17:9	ἕως οὗ ἐγερθῇ ἐντέλλομαι(?)	ἐντέλλομαι(?) Ἰησοῦς λέγων.... ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τὸν λόγον, τὸ ὅραμα.	somewhat negative

Though there are traces of Matthew's activity throughout the account, he appears to have been at work most vigorously in 17:2 and 17:6-7. These are precisely the two points which show the best structure in 17:1-9. At other points the structure does not appear to be of particular concern to Matthew. From this material we extract two preliminary conclusions regarding Matthew's differences from Mark, in their relation to the structure of 17:1-9:

(1) When Matthew's account is generally similar to Mark's, what differences there are are not motivated by structural or formal considerations. Indeed, the Matthean features often impair a structural pattern already found in Mark's account. Examples of this are found in 17:1, 17:4, and 17:9.

(2) When Matthew differs from Mark more extensively, however, or develops material not found in Mark at all, he does so with an eye to structural concerns. Indeed his form is best precisely where he most differs from Mark. Examples of this are found in 17:2 and 17:6-7.

It is as though Matthew, when acting as developer of tradition, considers both content and form important, and shapes his material into a well-structured composition; but when acting as preserver of tradition, considers content much the more important, and makes his alterations with little regard for their structural effect.

Structural Techniques in Matthew 17:1-9

Thus far we have considered discrete features within 17:1-9. It is now time to study Matthew's transfiguration account as a literary whole. Our immediate goal is an understanding of the structural techniques through which 17:1-9 is shaped.[1] Previcus attempts to deal with the "structure" of the transfiguration narratives, so far as we are aware, have not dealt with the literary structure of the accounts so much as the analysis of Mark 9:2-8 into component "sources." Thus Lohmeyer divided the passage into two parts, 9:2 (and 3), and 9:4-5, 7, and 8, with 9:6 left over for the narrator. Baltensweiler found the "original" account in 9:2-5, 7a, and 8. Müller separated it into 9:2c-6, 8, and 9:2ab, 7 (and 9). In the treatment of Sherman Johnson we find no less than three components: 9:2b-4 and 7, 9:5-6, and 9:8.[2] Now Johnson has at least the merit of attempting seriously an analysis of the material in the context of a commentary treatment of 9:2-8. But all these efforts are based upon motif or thematic study rather than upon stylistic or structural features which actually indicate divisions within the text itself. They treat divisions of ideas, rather than divisions of the text.

---

[1] We do not intend to pursue "structuralism" as developed by modern structural linguists such as A. J. Greimas, C. Bremond, and R. Barthes.

[2] See Lohmeyer, "Verklärung," pp. 187-88; Baltensweiler, Verklärung, p. 75; Hans-Peter Müller, "Die Verklärung Jesu," ZNTW 51 (1960): 56-57; and Sherman E. Johnson, "The Gospel According to St. Matthew," in The Interpreter's Bible, 12 vols. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1951), 7: 48.

The same must be said for students of Matthew's account. Since these handle Matthew 17:1-9 as part of a commentary upon the gospel as a whole, their approach is basically the same as that of Mark's commentators. The approach to the text is rather atomistic, discussing each motif in its theological and particularly history-of-religions significance, and in the order offered by the text. Any division of the text into components is dictated by thematic criticism rather than analysis of the structure of Matthew's own account. This is true of M'Neile, Michaelis, Filson, and Schlatter.[1] Lohmeyer's subservience to the standard "form" of the commentary is especially interesting in light of his earlier fundamental article on Mark 9:2-8.[2] Even Gaechter, who has the distinction of being the commentator most interested in literary form, confines his structural analysis largely to broad sections of the gospel, and does not analyze the structure of 17:1-9 itself.[3]

---

[1] M'Neile, Gospel, pp. 248-53; Michaelis, Evangelium, 2: 375-87; Floyd V. Filson, A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew, Harper's New Testament Commentaries (New York: Harper & Bros., 1960), pp. 190-193; Adolf Schlatter, Der Evangelist Matthäus (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1957), pp. 525-31.

[2] Lohmeyer, Evangelium, pp. 266-69. It is notorious that Lohmeyer had shifted his position by the time he wrote the commentary; the view of the transfiguration here presented is decisively different from that in the article of 1922 (Lohmeyer, "Verklärung"), particularly with regard to the history-of-religions background to the transfiguration. Yet he does not discuss his own change in position.

[3] Gaechter, Matthäus, pp. 563-572.

We begin with this task rather than the analysis of motifs or any division of the text on the basis of its themes. The following may be regarded as a series of experiments. Several approaches to a structural analysis of 17:1-9 are tested against the text. This yields, we believe, one approach to the structure of 17:1-9 which best fits Matthew's own intentions.

We may begin with the apparently obvious remark that the passage is composed continuously, that is, each verse is linked to the material preceding it by its opening words. This is verified by a quick survey of the opening phrases of each verse:

17:1 καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ ....
17:2 καὶ ....
17:3 καὶ ἰδού ....
17:4 ἀποκρίθεις δὲ ὁ Πέτρος ....
17:5 ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἰδού....
17:6 καὶ ἀκούσαντες....
17:7 καὶ ....
17:8 ἐπάραντες δὲ τούς ὀφθαλμούς αὐτῶν ....
17:9 καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ....

καὶ is used most often, occasionally replaced by δέ , and sometimes combined with participial phrases. Leaving aside verses 6 and 7, which do not occur in Mark at all, only the material in verse 5 above does not occur in more or less the same form in Mark's account. This material implies an even closer connection between the events of 17:4 and 17:5 than is found in Mark's parallel material; and the use of ἰδού is distinctive to

Matthew's account. But on the whole the introductory material is not the locus of Matthew's compositional activity.[1]

But this is to consider the connecting phrases by the criterion of word-usage alone. This is only one of several possible approaches; a functional analysis of the introductory phrases within 17:1-9 is more helpful in this case. For this purpose it is useful to define three types or functions of connectives: (1) the simple connective, linking two statements through some such word as "and," without specifying further the relationship between them, (2) the narrative connective, drawing the reader's attention to the previous statement even as it passes to the following one, and (3) the subject-matter connection, which links the two statements together by explicit reference to their content. All of these types may be seen in 17:1-9, as is illustrated in the following table:

17:1	καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος	subject-matter (serves as literary frame for the unit)
17:9	καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους....	
17:1	καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ	narrative (links the material to 16:28)
17:2	καὶ	simple (continues from 17:1; nothing specified by connective)

---

[1] See the discussion of connective style in Greek prose in F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament, trans. and rev. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), par. 458. The transfiguration certainly belongs to the "running" or "continuous" style discussed here. Whatever the contribution of the various evangelists to the account, it belongs as a whole to the common world of community-literature produced by the early church.

17:3	καὶ (ἰδού)	simple (continues from 17:2; nothing specified by connective)
17:4	ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος	narrative (ἀποκριθείς is ambiguous; it shows 17:4 as the response to 17:3. This may be further defined if δέ is an adversative counterpart to 17:3 καί).
17:4 17:5	ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος (ἰδου)	narrative (shows immediacy of the divine reaction to Peter's comment in 17:4)
17:3 17:5	καὶ ἰδοὺ ὤφθη αὐτοῖς ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἰδοὺ νεφέλη ... ἐπεσκίασεν ... καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης ...	narrative (ἰδού introduces "supernatural" events in 17:1-9, except the transformation.[1] It places events in the same category; there is no further structural tie of 17:3 to 17:5. Nor does this obscure the basic pattern, i.e. 17:4 is the reaction to 17:3, while 17:5 is the reaction to 17:4).

---

[1] See the discussion on p. 18 above.

17:5 (end) { φωνὴ ... λέγουσα ... ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

17:6 } καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθ.
17:7

(on the connections of 17:7 to 17:6 see pp. 25-31 above).

subject-matter

(admittedly the connection is curious. The ἀκούσαντες shows only physical hearing of the voice, not the "obedience" which is the goal of the command to "hear." At 17:4 the reaction is clear, but one is not precisely clear what is being reacted to; here one is sure what is being reacted to, but the precise nature of the reaction is unclear).

17:6-7 { ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ... ἐγέρθητε ....

17:8 { ἐπάραντες δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς οὐδένα εἶδον ....

subject-matter

(but the connection is curious, even ambiguous. ἐγέρθητε ... μὴ φοβεῖσθε is the response in 17:7 to the ἔπεσαν ... ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα of 17:6. We expect in 17:8 the response to the command ending 17:7, ἐγέρθητε. Instead, we have ἐπάραντες τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς. It is quite interesting that Mark agrees essentially with this, though the wording is different: καὶ ... περιβλεψάμενοι (9:8). It is unclear why the response to "rise" should be in terms of "seeing" and "eyes." The reference may be to the transfiguration as giving spiritual insight, or it may be, to contrast with the ὤφθη of 17:3, where Moses and Elijah appear with Jesus. Here, however, he stands alone before the disciples).

17:9	καί	simple (links the material to 17:8)
17:1	καί ἀναφέρει ... ὄρος	subject-matter (as indicated on p. 43 above, links these two verses together as a "frame" around the unit)
17:9	καί καταβαινόντων ... ὄρους	

If we now recount these types of connections, an interesting pattern emerges. This may be shown in the following table:

verse(s)	types of connectives
17:1-17:9	subject-matter
17:1	(narrative)
17:2	simple
17:3	simple
17:4	narrative
17:5-17:4	narrative
17:5-17:3	narrative
17:6-7 - 17:5	subject-matter
17:8 - 17:6-7	subject-matter
17:9	simple
17:9-17:1	subject-matter

If we leave aside the connections of 17:1 to 17:9, which "frame" the pericope, and the connection of 17:1 to 16:28, which anchors the unit within the flow of Matthew's narrative, we have three sets of connections. The story opens with two uses of the simple connective, and closes in the same way (considering 17:9 in its relationship to 17:8). Within the unit 17:1-9 there are three instances of narrative connection, followed by two of subject-matter. In other words, as Matthew's account progresses, his connectives tend to become more complex, to relate the parts of his story to one another in a more and more integral way, and thus to involve the reader more and more integrally in the developing narrative. This process reaches its climax precisely in the material unique to Matthew's account, 17:6-7, where we find the instances of subject-matter connection (to 17:5 and 17:8 respectively). It is worth noting also that the narrative connections (17:5 to 17:4 and 17:5 to 17:3-- ἐτὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος and ἰδού) are not found in Mark's account. This suggests that while the words themselves which connect elements of 17:1-9 to one another are not distinctive to Matthew, their functioning as connectives does reflect Matthew's compositional activity.

Moving now to elements of 17:1-9 other than its connecting phrases and terms, it is natural to ask once again about the structural effect of those features in which Matthew differs from Mark. These are listed in the following table, together with an attempt to evaluate their impact upon the verse in which they occur and upon the structure of 17:1-9 as a whole. Words found in Mark but not in Matthew are indicated by a minus sign (-); others are Matthean "additions" with respect to Mark.

Verse	Considerable structural effect	Some, or uncertain, effect	no structural effect
17:1	μόνους (-) (loses parallel to μόνον of 17:8)		τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ τόν (-)

17:2	λάμπω, πρόσωπον, ἥλιος, ὡς τὸ φῶς στίλβοντα, γναφεὺς, λίαν(-) (results in good structure)		
17:3	ἰδού (relates 17:3 to 17:5)		ἦσαν(-) Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἠλίας (the order is reversed from Mark)
17:4		εἰ θέλεις, οὐ γάρ...ἐγένοντο(-) (removal of material in Mark 9:6. Does remove a parallel to the opening of 17:4)	(in Mark, ποιήσωμεν). κύριος replaces Mark's ῥαββί.
17:5	ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος (relates to 17:4) ἰδού (relates to 17:3; used two times)	ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα	φωτεινή
17:6	οἱ μαθηταί, πίπτω, πρόσωπον, φοβέομαι, σφόδρα (forms good structure with 17:7)		
17:7	προσέρχομαι, ἅπτω, ἐγειρώ, μὴ φοβεῖσθε (forms good structure with 17:6)		

17:8			There is an extensive variation between Matthew and Mark here; the ideas are the same however. The structure of 17:8 is not clear, and the structural effects of Matthew's features hard to determine.
17:9		Matthew has nothing to correspond to Mark 9:10. 17:9 and Mark 9:9 express generally similar ideas but the wording varies considerably. The effect of Matthew's features upon structure is hard to determine.	

The material above suggests an important negative conclusion. The features in which Matthew's account differs from Mark's appear in all three columns; they have considerable, some, and no structural effect upon the passage 17:1-9. If there is a consistent pattern behind Matthew's differences from Mark, it is not a pattern based upon structural considerations. Although many of these differences are structurally significant, we cannot establish that Matthew has systematically altered his source with the primary purpose of achieving good structure throughout 17:1-9.

In order to test this conclusion we now want to cut our cake in a different way. Each of the above columns will be examined separately, and its elements set against three criteria: (1) whether the subject-matter is Jesus or the disciples, (2) whether it is an addition or a subtraction with

XUM

respect to Mark's account, and (3) whether it is consistent with Matthean usage.[1]

Verse and feature		Subject	Relation to Mark's account	Usage
(1) Features having considerable structural significance				
17:1	μόνους	both	subtraction	unclear
17:2	λάμπω, πρόσωπον, ἥλιος, ὡς τὸ φῶς	Jesus	addition	unusual
17:3,5	ἰδού	neither	addition	distinctive
17:5	ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος	disciples (Peter)	addition	usual
17:6	οἱ μαθηταί, πίπτω, πρόσωπον, φοβέομαι, σφόδρα	disciples	addition	unusual
17:7	προσέρχομαι, ἅπτω, ἐγείρω μὴ φοβεῖσθε	Jesus	addition	mixed
(2) Features having some, or uncertain, structural significance				
17:4	εἰ θέλεις	Jesus	addition	usual
	οὐ γαρ ... ἐγένοντο	disciples (Peter)	subtraction	usual
17:5	ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα	Jesus	addition	usual (in connection with the baptism at 3:17)

---

[1] The second and third categories are based on our examination of 17:1-9 on pp. 12-40 above.

(3) Features having no structural significance

17:1 τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ	disciples	addition	unclear
17:3 Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἠλίας	neither	reverses Markan order	consistent with Matthew's emphasis on Moses
ἦσαν	neither	subtraction	unclear
17:4 κύριος	Jesus	alteration of terminology	usual
ποιήσω	disciples	alteration	unusual
17:5 φωτεινή	Jesus	addition	unusual
17:9 Ἰησοῦς, ἐγέρθη	Jesus	addition	unusual
ἐνετείλατο(αὐτοῖς)	both	addition	usual
τον λόγον	Jesus	subtraction	unclear

A survey of the above reveals nothing in the way of a consistent pattern. The subject-matter varies within each of the three categories of structural significance. Both additions and subtractions are found in each category. Usual and unusual stylistic features are also found in each (though the second category favors features generally consistent with Matthew's style). The thrust of the material is clear: none of these criteria serve to correlate Matthew's alterations with respect to Mark's account with different levels of structural effect.

This survey does suggest, however, another line of approach. For it is striking that--apart from occasional material related to 17:1 and 17:3,5--the "subject-matter" of the alterations is either Jesus or the disciples. We now want to examine this more closely. Once again, material present in Mark but not in Matthew is indicated by a minus sign (-), while words not thus identified are present in Matthew but not in Mark.

Verse	Material on Jesus	Material on the disciples	Other
17:1		τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ τόν (-)	μόνους(-)
17:2	λάμπω, πρόσωπον, ἥλιος, ὡς τὸ φῶς στιλβοντα, γναφευς, λιαν (-)		
17:3			Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἠλίας (order reversed) ἦσαν (-) ἰδού
17:4	κύριος replaces Mark's ῥαββί εἰ θέλεις	οὐ γάρ (-) ποιήσω replaces Mark's ποιήσωμεν.	
17:5	ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος (indicates the immediacy of the response to Peter's comment in 17:4. The emphasis is upon Jesus), ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα		ἰδού ἰδου φωτεινή
17:6		οἱ μαθηταί, πίπτω, πρόσωπον, φοβέομαι, σφόδρα	
17:7	προσέρχομαι, ἅπτω, ἐγείρω, μὴ φοβεῖσθε		
17:8	αὐτόν μεθ' ἑαυτῶν(-)	ἐπαίρω, ὀφθαλμούς (Mark's idea is similar) οὐκέτι (-)	

17:9 , ὁ Ἰησοῦς
{ ἐνετείλατο (Mark has
{ διεστείλατο).
{ ἐγερθῇ (Mark has
{ ἀναστῇ).

, τὸ ὅραμα
τὸν λόγον(-)

Confining our attention to the columns of material about Jesus and about the disciples, we observe that only two verses have material in both. In verse 4 Matthew uses κύριος to refer to Jesus, and he makes Peter say "If you [Jesus] wish . . ." He emphasizes Peter's role by using the singluar ποιήσω , and omits the material in Mark 9:6, that Peter "did not know what he was saying." The use of εἰ θέλεις is consistent with Matthew's approach to Peter; the immediate reference is to Jesus, but the statement has the same apparent effect as the omission of Mark 9:6, to "soften" the impression of Peter's brash statement.[1] This perhaps shifts the weight of Matthew's material toward the disciples; though the use of κύριος of course refers to Jesus, it is the recognition of Jesus by the disciples which is the chief concern. Verse 8 also has material on both Jesus and the disciples. But the point of the ἐπάραντες δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς is surely that now the disciples see Jesus, and Jesus alone. This is emphasized by the use of αὐτόν and the omission of μεθ' ἑαυτῶν . Thus the focus is upon Jesus in 17:8.

A summary of the subject-matter of each of Matthew's features in 17:1-9 reveals a most interesting pattern. This may be presented in the

---

[1] This is the immediate impression yielded by a reading of the passage, and is almost universally assumed to be Matthew's intention. It may be that his attitude to Peter is considerably more complex. We investigate the possibility in chapter three.

XUM

following table:

Verse	Subject-Matter of Matthean features
17:1	disciples
17:2	Jesus
17:3	--
17:4	disciples (and Jesus)
17:5	Jesus
17:6	disciples
17:7	Jesus
17:8	disciples (and Jesus)
17:9	Jesus

Verse 3 falls outside the pattern, as its features concern neither the disciples nor Jesus. Verses 4 and 8 contain features regarding both. But the tendency is for the weight of our response to Matthew's narrative to fall first upon the side of the disciples, then upon that of Jesus. This is especially clear through 17:7; up to that point the emphasis alternates nicely between the two. And although the chief focus in 17:8 is clearly Jesus, the verse opens with a reference to the disciples, thus drawing our attention to them first of all. This tends to preserve the pattern of alternation between the disciples and Jesus right through to the end of the passage.

Now this suggests a distinctive type of literary structure, about which we have heard little in redaction-critical work so far. We may term this a "dramatic" type of structure. There are two foci of interest in 17:1-9, the disciples and Jesus their Lord. This much is obvious from the introduction, where Jesus is pictured taking the disciples up the mountain.

We now see that Matthew's distinctive features, his additions and subtractions with respect to Mark 9:2-8, are aimed at preserving the identity of these two foci and, one might even say, of developing the tension between them; the reader's attention is shifted first to one and then to the other precisely by those features of the narrative which are Matthew's own contribution.

This basic pattern may be stated in another way with perhaps even greater effect. Consider the movement of 17:1-9 as a dramatic narrative. It presents a series of alternating actions and reactions, as shown in the following arrangement:

Verse	Action	Reaction
17:1	ascent of mount; Jesus takes his disciples with him	
17:2	the transfiguration of Jesus	
17:3	appearance of Moses and Elijah	
17:4		Peter's response: tents
17:5	appearance of the cloud, testifying to Jesus	
17:6		disciples' response: prostration
17:7	Jesus approaches and raises the disciples	
17:8		disciples' response: they see Jesus
17:9	descent of mountain: Jesus leads and commands his disciples	

This does not correspond exactly to the pattern demonstrated on page 54,

XUM

for 17:1-3 form a single unit of "action," whereas Matthew's development of these verses dealt with the disciples (17:1), Jesus (17:2), and then neither of these two (17:3). But the thrust of the two patterns is the same; and after 17:1-3, the focus shifts between action and reaction right through to the end of the passage.

This literary-structural conclusion is confirmed by a purely grammatical point. The first three verses open with finite verbs. After this each successive verse opens with a participial phrase. Matthew retains this pattern even in material which he does not share with Mark, except only for 17:7, where the finite verb is followed immediately by a participial phrase. After three verses beginning with finite verbs, the shift from action to reaction is signalled by participial phrases.

From a theological point of view the pattern is equally striking. Jesus is the subject of all the verses in the "action" column on page 55; the disciples the subject of all the verses in the "reaction" column. It is Jesus who initiates, the disciples who react. Their discipleship lies in responding to their Lord. Furthermore, Jesus both opens and closes the narrative 17:1-9; he has not only the first word, but the last as well.

All this suggests that Matthew's primary structural intention was "dramatic," that is, it sought to involve the reader of his gospel in a scene of great intensity and vitality, in which the focus shifts constantly from Jesus to his disciples and back again. It is not aimed at the explication of motifs but at engaging the reader in the whole of 17:1-9, directing his attention first to Jesus' actions and then to the reactions of his disciples. It is almost as if we were watching a play, our eyes shifting automatically from one character to another, as each speaks in turn. And, as in a good drama, the reader is surely drawn into the action. He has before him the pattern of disciples responding to Jesus' initiative. The theological content of Jesus' actions, and the disciples' reactions, remains to be investigated in chapter three. But there can be no doubt that the disciples are the pattern for the reader's own life, which must be lived in response to the demands of the Lord.[1]

Conclusion: The Composition of Matthew 17:1-9

Our investigations may be summarized in this way. Firstly, on the level of individual verses in 17:1-9, a two-fold tendency is apparent. Where Matthew agrees for the most part with the account found in Mark, those changes he does make are not made with a view to their structural effect. But where Matthew differs considerably from the account in Mark, or even develops material not found in Mark at all, he shows considerable interest in structure. The general principle is that Matthean structure improves as Matthew's account moves away from Mark and toward his own free composition. The primary examples of this are 17:2 and 17:6-7.

Secondly, on the level of 17:1-9 as a literary whole, several tendencies are apparent. Distinctive Matthean features are not added or removed from Mark's account for the general purpose of developing a structure--in the traditional sense, one marked by literary techniques--in 17:1-9. For some of these elements contribute to the structure of the passage, but others do not do so. The problem lies in finding precisely what kind of "structure" the Matthean material does in fact develop; and for this we have suggested that the concept of a "dramatic" structure is most adequate. Matthew's structural intention is to involve his reader in a narrative which shifts his attention from Jesus to the disciples and back again, with Jesus standing at the beginning and the end of the story, and with the disciples, in their reactions to Jesus' initiatives, as a paradigm for the reader.

---

[1] We can only speculate upon the implications of this for Matthew's audience. It is equally impossible to determine the origin of this "dramatic" structure. It might have its roots in the catechetical style of question and answer; or in certain worship experiences such as the responsive reading, in the congregation; or in a historicizing of a quality of Jesus' ministry remembered among the early believers as being basic--his challenge to them; that they re-orient their lives is the one sure thing we do know about the disciples after the resurrection of the Lord.

It is important to determine Matthew's true originality in developing this structure. There are grounds for believing that the basic pattern is not Matthew's own but came to him through the tradition. For we may also analyse Mark 9:1-9 in a similar way, showing that the pattern of action/reaction is present there as well. In Mark's account, however, there are only five elements, 9:1-4 (action), 9:5 (reaction), 9:7 (action), 9:8 (reaction), and 9:9 (action). (9:6 stands to the side as a comment by the evangelist, quite extraneous to the flow of the narrative). This account also shifts back and forth between Jesus and the disciples. Matthew's originality, then, does not lie in his creating the pattern, but in enlarging and intensifying it (for example, the omission of Mark 9:6--whatever we may say about its effect upon the picture of Peter--removes an element extraneous to the dramatic development of the narrative). Matthew's intentionality in expanding the narrative is shown by the fact that 17:6-7 preserves the pattern of dramatic structure; for 17:6 concerns the disciples, and 17:7 Jesus, just as the pattern requires. The end result is a narrative expanded from five elements in Mark's account to precisely seven in Matthew's.

Matthew's transfiguration account, then, is a development of that found in Mark's gospel. The primary foci of Matthean activity in 17:1-9 are verses 2 and 6-7. The account presents through a seven-fold structure a picture of Jesus in relationship with his disciples. It remains to see how these features relate to the theology of the account itself, and to the theology and the structure of Matthew's gospel as a whole. It is to the last of these matters that we turn in chapter two.

CHAPTER II

MATTHEW'S SEVEN MOUNTAINS

The Seven Mountains

When Jesus meets his disciples upon the mountain at the climax of Matthew's gospel, he is not standing on strange ground.[1] The mountain of 28:16 is the culmination of a pattern of seven mountains occurring throughout the gospel as scenes of Jesus' activity and, usually, of the disciples' response. To this pattern--and thus to the gospel as a whole--Matthew's transfiguration account is connected through its setting on a mountain (17:1).

ὄρος occurs sixteen times in Matthew, at 4:8, 5:1, 5:14, 8:1, 14:23, 15:29, 17:1, 17:9, 17:20, 18:12, 21:1, 21:21, 24:3, 24:16, 26:30, and 28:16. Five of these are pronouncements of Jesus. A wisdom saying on discipleship occurs at 5:14, and with this we might place the saying on lordship of 18:12; the capabilities of faith are considered in 17:20 and (making the same point in another context) 21:21. The last of these uses, 24:16, belongs to apocalyptic.[2]

---

[1] For the original suggestion that there are seven mountains in Matthew's gospel I am indebted to Professor Herman Waetjen. This was the "germ of an idea" from which the present chapter grew.

[2] One might show Matthew's special interest in mountains even in this material. While 24:16 is found in all three synoptics, and 21:21 is shared with Mark, the other three references are unique to Matthew. Matthew 5:14 has only John's comment for a parallel: "I am the light

XUM

The remaining eleven references serve to locate events in Matthew's narrative upon mountains. They are grouped as follows:

1. 4:8, the third temptation: πάλιν παραλαμβάνει
   αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν λίαν
2. 5:1, 8:1, the Sermon on the Mount:
   Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος
   Καταβάντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους
3. 14:23, ascent of the mountain for prayer:
   καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος
4. 15:29, prelude to healing and feeding of the crowd:
   καὶ ἀναβὰς εἰς τὸ ὄρος
5. 17:1, 17:9, the transfiguration:
   καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν
   καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους
6. 21:1, 24:3, 26:30, the events of Passion Week:
   καὶ ἦλθον . . . εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν
   καθημένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν
   καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν
7. 28:16, the missionary charge:
   οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐπορεύθησαν . . . εἰς τὸ ὄρος
   οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς

There are seven mountains described in these eleven references. Both ascent and descent are described in 5:1, 8:1 and 17:1, 17:9; the double reference provides a literary "frame" around events upon the mountain.

---

of the world" (8:12). Luke 15:14 alters Matthew 18:12 from ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη to ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ . Luke 17:6 alters Matthew 17:20 from τῷ ὄρει to τῇ συκαμίνῳ (!). However, our interest is in those mountains significant within the narrative structure of Matthew's gospel.

XUM

The references 21:1, 24:3, and 26:30 pose more of a problem. The scenes are widely separated in Matthew's narrative; there is no question of a single, continuous event here. But the mountain is carefully labelled each time as the "Mount of Olives." This mountain unifies the events of passion week up to the point of the arrest, trials, and death of Jesus. He goes to the Mount of Olives immediately upon his arrival in Jerusalem; he delivers an apocalyptic discourse there halfway through the week; he goes there to pray, as the prelude to his arrest. The Mount of Olives is for Matthew one mountain, upon which three events happen during the first stage of passion week.

Now it is worth noting at this point that Matthew has gone to some trouble to obtain his "seven" mountains. This is evident from a comparison with the other gospels. Of Mark's eleven references to ὄρος, for example, we may remove 11:23 and 13:14 as pronouncements of Jesus (cf. Matthew 21:21 and 24:16 respectively). We may also remove Mark 5:5 and 5:11, as these relate the demoniac and the herd of swine to hills, but do not necessarily locate the action upon a hill. This leaves four mountains in Mark's gospel, 3:16 (call of the twelve), 6:46 (prayer), 9:2, 9:9 (enclosing the transfiguration account), and 11:1, 13:3, and 14:26 (the Mount of Olives). Matthew retains all these except of the call of the disciples in 3:16. (We must return to this later. For the moment we only point out that Matthew may have intended the Sermon on the Mount as a substitute. The Sermon is introduced by the phrase in Mark, ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος).

It is doubtful that Q contained any mountain material. If we examine Matthew's references to ὄρος in a synopsis, we are struck by the

XUM

fact that there is no passage in which Matthew and Luke agree against Mark. There are only four passages in which all three synoptics use the term (Matthew 17:1-9 and parallels, the transfiguration; Matthew 21:1 and parallels, and 26:30 and parallels, the Mount of Olives; and Matthew 24:16 and parallels, in an apocalyptic statement of Jesus). There is no reason to assume that Matthew and Luke record a tradition independent of Mark in any of these cases. The apocalyptic material is in identical wording; the Mount of Olives references are very close on both occasions. There is more variety in the transfiguration accounts, but here Matthew is manifestly closer to Mark than to Luke.

Luke himself shows independence in his use of the mountain. Once again we may remove apocalyptic references such as Luke 21:21 and 23:30 (the latter is unique to Luke). The reference in 3:5 to Isaiah 50:4 is important theologically in Luke's understanding of Jesus' ministry, but is of no structural significance for his narrative. And Luke 8:32 agrees with Mark 5:11 in locating the swine upon a hill; but he does not explicitly locate the event itself there. This leaves four mountains as settings for events within Luke's narrative. In 4:29 is the attempt to cast Jesus down from the "brow of a hill," a unique amplification of the preaching described in Mark 6:1ff. and Matthew 13:53ff. The others are common to the three synoptics. Luke 6:12 parallels Matthew 5:1, but Luke has Jesus descend after prayer in order to deliver the sermon. The ascent of the mount of transfiguration, and the descent, are described in 9:28 and 9:37; the Mount of Olives occurs in 19:29, 21:37, and 22:39. Here Luke differs from Matthew and Mark in omitting the reference to the mount in Jesus' apocalyptic discourse (Mark 13:3, Matthew 24:3). He transfers the apocalyptic discourse to the context of the temple (Luke 21:5) and gives the second of the three Mount of Olives references, 21:37, over to a summary statement about Jesus' passion week ministry: Jesus spent his days teaching in the temple; at night he withdrew to the Mount of Olives (see also 22:38). He makes explicit the structural significance of the Mount of Olives, in fact, for the ministry of Jesus during passion week. It is the "home base" for Jesus' activities. This is precisely its implicit significance for both Matthew and Mark.[1]

We may glance finally at John's gospel. Omitting 8:1 as part of the inauthentic section 7:53-8:11,[2] there are only four references to ὄρος in the gospel. The prelude to John's account of the feeding (6:3) of the 5,000 mentions the term, and parallels Matthew's account of the feeding of the 4,000 (in Matthew 14:23 Jesus ascends the ὄρος). The usage in 6:15 is unique to John; it records Jesus' withdrawal as kingship is forced upon him. From these it appears that the mountain has no structural significance in John, and is of little importance to him. Perhaps the clue to this--if we may speak theologically for a moment--lies in 4:20-21. Against the Samaritans, who claim Gerizim as their sacred mountain instead of Jerusalem, Jesus reveals that God is not properly to

---

[1] See the discussion on p. 62 above.

[2] It is interesting that this section does locate Jesus upon the Mount of Olives during his stay in Jerusalem. In this it agrees with the synoptic accounts of that stay; in John's account, however, there is no mention of the Mount of Olives. Thus 7:53-8:11 relates to the synoptic tradition at this point.

XUM

be worshipped upon any mountain, but in the Spirit. For John the mountain is the symbol of the old, material worship--both Samaritan and Jewish!--now superseded in Jesus. For this reason he disdains it as a structural element in his gospel.[1]

This survey reveals a considerable variety in the evangelists' use of the mountain. Now we must ask whether any patterns emerge from this material. We begin with the two mountains common to the synoptics, that of transfiguration and the Mount of Olives. Here if anywhere we would expect to find a "mountain-tradition" which, even in pre-synoptic material, located certain events upon the mountain.

Perhaps the most interesting literary feature of the mountain-material in the transfiguration account is the mention of the descent (Matthew 17:9 and parallels). This is striking because the descent is so rarely mentioned in synoptic scenes set on a mountain, in fact otherwise only at Matthew 8:1.[2] The only parallel, then, to 17:1, 17:9 is Matthew 5:1, 8:1, where the ascent and descent are also a literary device to provide a "frame" for the event upon the mountain. And into this is woven another literary device, the description characterizing the Sermon as one of the five discourses. The structure of this material may be set forth as follows:

---

[1] Matthew also believes the mountain has been superseded in Jesus. On this see chapter three, particularly the discussion of 28:16-20.

[2] This reminds one of the interesting comment in David Daube, The Sudden in the Scriptures (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964), p. 72, that the beginning of an event in the gospel narratives is usually of greater significance than its conclusion. The implications of this for form criticism should be explored, since the weight often falls according to that discipline on the end--on the saying of Jesus or the crowd's reaction.

XUM

5:1 Ἰδὼν δὲ, τοὺς ὄχλους
ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος

7:28 καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
τοὺς λόγους τούτος, ἐξεπλήσοντο
οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ

8:1 καταβάντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους
ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί.

A chiasm is formed by 5:1 and 8:1; 5:1a corresponds to 8:1b (ὄχλος) and 5:1b to 8:1a (ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος ... καταβάντος ... ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους). The parallelism extends to the verbs: ἀναβαίνω and καταβαίνω. With this polished design we may compare the beginning and end of the transfiguration narratives.

Matthew 17:1ff. (Mark 9:2ff. similar)	Luke 9:28ff.
17:1 καὶ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον κ.τ.λ. ... καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑφηλόν	9:28 ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ καὶ παραλαβὼν Πέτρον κ.τ.λ. ..., ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι
17:9 καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς	9:37 ἐγένετο δὲ τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ κατελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους

Matthew and Mark stand together against Luke; it is interesting that Luke is closer to them in his beginning than his ending. But we are hardly compelled to find a special Lukan tradition here.[1] Again Matthew shows a chiastic structure: 17:1a corresponds to 17:9b, and 17:1b to 17:9a. But ἀναφέρω and καταβαίνω do not offer the polished balance of the verbs used in Matthew 5:1, 8:1. Luke's structure is different; the indications of time relate 9:28a to 9:37a, leaving 9:28b parallel to 9:37b. The form is not abba, but abab. Luke's verbs do not provide the balance of those used in Matthew 5:1, 8:1. The implication is that Matthew and, for that matter, Luke, took over the account of the transfiguration from Mark; but Matthew himself composed the *structure* of the Sermon account in 5:1, 8:1, whatever we say about his relation to the content of Luke's Sermon on the Plain. Despite the similarity in certain respects between 17:1, 17:9 and 5:1, 8:1 we conclude that the descent from the mount was part of the tradition Matthew received in 17:1-9 but not of the tradition from which he developed the Sermon on the Mount.

---

[1] Lohmeyer, Evangelium, p. 267 concluded from the similarity of the transfiguration narratives: "wenige Erzählungen sind so fest überliefert." The idea of a special Lukan transfiguration source was put forth by Schlatter. See for this Matthäus, pp. 530-31. This raises again the possibility of its presence in Q. On this see our discussion of the mountain in Q on pp. 62-63 above, the discussion of the transfiguration and source criticism in n. 3, p. 5 above, and also Weiss, Matthäus-Evangelium, pp. 304-06, and particularly Bernhard Weiss, Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums (Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta, 1907), pp. 183-86.

We have less to say about the other mountain common to the synoptics, the Mount of Olives. It is generally assumed that the synoptics follow a tradition describing the passion week that is more firmly established in its sequence than most other parts of the synoptic material. In general Matthew follows Mark's account. We have already noted Luke's alteration of the middle reference to the Mount of Olives; but despite his more extensive re-ordering of the material, he has retained the scheme of a three-fold reference to the Mount of Olives. This strengthens the suspicion that there was a tradition prior to Mark describing the three occurrences of the Mount of Olives during the passion week.

We come now to mountains which Matthew shares with only one of the

XUM

other synoptics. There is only one such case, Matthew 14:23 = Mark 6:46. With this pericope we begin to encounter Matthew's distinctive interests. In Matthew and Mark this mountain forms the prelude to the stilling of the storm (Matthew 14:22-33, Mark 6:45-52). Matthew's particular concern here is with Jesus' solitude upon the mountain. To Mark 6:46 he adds that Jesus went up κατ' ἰδίαν. This is reinforced by his addition to Mark 6:47; when evening came, Jesus μόνος ἦν ἐκεῖ. Matthew gives only two accounts of Jesus at prayer upon the mountain, here and at 26:36; and it is only here that Jesus is quite alone.

We have surveyed the mountain references which Matthew shares with one or more of the other synoptics. We are left with four mountains--of a total of seven--which are unique to Matthew. The first is the mount of the final temptation, 4:8-10. Now one might consider a mountain necessary for this temptation--to show Jesus "all the kingdoms of the world" one would seem to need a high vantage point--but Luke manages quite comfortably without one in 4:5-8 (ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου).[1] While one might say that the mountain is implied in the ἀναγαγών of Luke 4:5, the fact remains that he does not make it explicit, whereas Matthew does. The importance of the mountain is further emphasized by a difference of order between Matthew's account and Luke's:

Matthew		Luke	
Bread	4:3-4	Bread	4:3-4
Temple	4:5-7	Kingdoms	4:5-8
Kingdoms	4:8-10	Temple	4:9-12
(mount is explicit)		(mount is implicit)	

---

[1] Unless otherwise noted, quotations are from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible.

Matthew's temptations are so arranged as to culminate on a mountain explicitly mentioned. It is worth noting also that instead of Luke's negative conclusion (οὐκ πειράσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου, 4:12), we have in Matthew a positive command (κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις , 4:10).

Matthew's special interest in the mountain is also clear in our next scene, 5:1-8:1. We have already noted Matthew's explicit mention of the descent as something quite unusual. For Mark and Luke this mountain was the scene of the call of the twelve, Mark 3:13-19 and Luke 6:12-16. A contextual comparison is revealing. We may compare Matthew 4:24-25 with Mark 3:7-12 and Luke 6:17-19. Mark and Luke include a generalizing summary of Jesus' activity: ". . . . also from Judea and Jerusalem and Idumea and from beyond the Jordan and from about Tyre and Sidon a great multitude, hearing all that he did, came to him."[1] Mark concludes with healings followed by the theme of the demons' recognition of Jesus, and the command to secrecy (3:10-12). Then follows the call of the twelve upon the mountain, 3:13ff. Luke concludes in 6:18-19 with an account of Jesus' healings, then passes to the Sermon on the Plain in 6:20ff. Matthew omits these motifs of healing and of secrecy; he passes immediately from a geographical summary in 4:25 to the Sermon on the Mount in 5:1ff. And the summary shows Jesus' following coming from all areas of Palestine: "and he went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues and preaching

---

[1] The quotation is from Mark 3:7-8. Luke 6:17-18 reveals his own interests: ". . . . from all Judea and Jerusalem and the seacoast of Tyre and Sidon . . . ." Luke is already looking westward in his mention of the "seacoast."

. . . and healing . . . . So his fame spread throughout all Syria, . . . And great crowds followed him from Galilee and the Decapolis and Jerusalem and Judea and from beyond the Jordan" (6:23-25). The area is larger than that claimed by Mark or Luke; and it includes Gentile areas. Probably these people are the ὄχλοι referred to in 5:1; the Sermon is intended as teaching for all men, Gentiles as well as Jews, who choose to "hear" Jesus.[1] This strikingly universalistic event is located upon the mountain.

Matthew's hand is evident also in the next mountain scene, 15:29ff. The scene extends to 15:39 and is thus parallel to two Marcan narratives, 7:31-37 and 8:1-10. The first of these is set ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως. After a series of healings, found in 7:32-37, Mark introduces a new scene through the phrase ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου ὄντος (8:1a) and proceeds to the feeding of the 4,000. Matthew unifies the two events by introducing the feeding account with ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν (15:32). The action is continuous with the healings of 15:29-31. And this two-fold event is set upon the mountain through the phrase καὶ ἀναβὰς εἰς τὸ ὄρος of 15:29.

We have left the final event in Matthew's gospel, the mission charge of 28:16-20. This shares some features with other material in the synoptic tradition. This may be seen if we set two accounts side by side:

---

[1] On this question see chapter three.

XUM

Matthew 28:19	Mark 16:15 (spurious)
πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρος	πορευθέντες εἰς τὸ κόσμον ἅπαντα κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει ... ὁ πιστεύσαντες καὶ βαπτισθεὶς σωθήσεται

πορευθέντες and βαπτίζω are interesting common features; κηρύξατε and μαθητεύσατε make the same affirmation--the mission takes priority in the life of the church--but in terms characteristic of each gospel. But the striking similarity is the universalism found in both πάντα τὰ ἔθνη and πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει. A comparison with Luke 24:47 is also interesting. In addition to the ὄνομα we found in Matthew 28, there is also the note of universalism: καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. Even this brief examination reveals a tradition from the later church, appearing in all three synoptics--though added to Mark's gospel only later--stressing the universalism of the church's mission. This common tradition makes all the more interesting the particular circumstances of the charge in each of the gospels. The mountain setting certainly did not come from this tradition; Matthew himself has chosen to locate his mission charge just there.

We have now surveyed Matthew's seven mountains, comparing them with contexts to which them may be related in other gospels. Let us summarize the results so far. Of the seven mountains, two (17:1; 21:1, 24:3, 26:30 and parallels) are common to the synoptic gospels. One (14:23) is shared with Mark (6:46). Two mountains may be related to other synoptic material, but Matthew is independent in his treatment and development of them. Thus the mount of temptation (4:8) may be hinted at in Luke 4:5, but Matthew makes the mountain explicit and orders his temptation narratives so as to bring it into prominence. The mountain of 5:1ff. has its parallel in Mark 3:13 and Luke 6:12, but Matthew changes both the context and the event which occurs there. The remaining two mountains are Matthean creations (15:29 and 28:16). As we pass along this list we find increasing evidence of Matthew's creative activity; we begin with straightforward adoption of the tradition and end with straightforward creation of his own material. While each of the synoptists shows some independence in his use of mountain settings, Matthew is by far the most advanced, not only in the number of occurrences but in the extent of his compositional work with them. In Matthew, then, we have the deliberate development of a scheme of seven mountains.

A Form-Critical Analysis of the Seven Mountains

What was Matthew's intention in developing this scheme? To answer this question we must ask another: what patterns link these seven mountains to one another? Most scholars have denied the presence of any significant pattern of mountains in Matthew. Much of this criticism has missed the (literary) point. It has been noted that ὄρος is ambiguous; it can refer to a mountain, but also to "mountains" or mountainous terrain, and even to a plain or desert.[1] This is properly

---

[1] Gustaf Dalman, Orte und Wege Jesu, 3rd ed. (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1924), pp. 166-67. One notes in Werner Foerster, TWNT 5: 475, that the ambiguity between singular and plural meanings goes back to classical times.

XUM

directed against efforts to find a specific geographical location for each ὄρος. It does not touch the question of Matthew's intention in creating a pattern of seven mountains. Study of this problem must begin with the empirical observation of a fact--there are uses of the term ὄρος arranged in such a pattern in the gospel--and not with lexicographical arguments about the "definition" of ὄρος. For Matthew's definition of ὄρος is determined by its usage, including structural usage, in his own gospel. If the location of the mount of transfiguration (or, indeed, any of Matthew's mountains) is not to be sought on a map, neither is it to be found in the lexicon.[1]

Discussion of the mountain in Matthew has been almost exclusively concerned with the typological relationship of 5:1 and 17:1 to Sinai (Exodus 24 and 34).[2] The most important discussion is that of Foerster in TWNT, where it is claimed that the gospels do not link important events through their common mountain settings.[3] But his own understanding of, for example, the mountain location of Matthew 5:1-8:1, seems rather fanciful. He is concerned above all to find an historical explanation, not a literary one, for the setting: Jesus may have delivered his sermon upon the mountain because the voice carries well in the hills (!).[1] There is also a theological--perhaps we should say existential--element in his discussion: Jesus may have chosen the mount for a setting because the secluded location would force the multitudes to "decide" whether to follow him out there or not.[2]

---

[1] Nothing is more typical of the shift in gospel studies than the fact that many earlier commentaries begin their discussion of 17:1-9 with the problem of the geographical identification of the "mountain." Tabor and Hermon were the chief contenders. See for example Henry B. Swete, The Gospel According to St. Mark, 3rd ed. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1913), p. 187, for this in a discussion of the Marcan parallel. The great earnestness of this debate is still maintained to a degree even as recently as C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to St. Mark (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1963), pp. 289-90.

[2] For guidance in this vast field one may begin with the commentaries ad loc. The strict--not to say obsessive--denial of such a relationship is of course Paul Nepper-Christensen, Das Matthäusevangelium: Ein Judenchristliches Evangelium? (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1958), cf. pp. 173-77.

[3] Specifically aimed against Lohmeyer's opinion of Mark 3:13.

All such approaches have one thing in common--a reference external to Matthew's gospel, whether it be to Exodus, to Palestinian geography, to a theology of radical decision, or to acoustical engineering. Our own concern is with the empirical evidence, with Matthew's manifest usage of the mountain as a setting for Jesus' activities. We propose now a form-critical survey of the mountain-scenes in Matthew, beginning not with an abstract or presupposed mountain "form," but with the phenomena recorded in the text. These may be examined systematically according to their formal elements.

---

[1] Foerster, TWNT 5: 480, n. 18. W. D. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1964), p. 99, notes that Luke 6:17 indicates that the sermon was delivered upon the "plain" in Q, that is, after the descent from the mount.

[2] Foerster, TWNT 5: 485, following Schlatter, Matthäus, pp. 128ff. At least Bultmann noted that the decision is required by the preaching itself, not before; one decides how to respond to the preacher, not whether or not to go to church!

XUM

(1) Introductory Words

We find usually a statement of circumstances, then a description of movement to the mountain. The initial statement varies greatly. καί (14:23, 15:29, 17:1, 21:1, 26:3), δέ (5:1, 24:3, 28:16), and πάλιν (4:8, dictated by the sequence of temptation accounts), are all used. Finite verbs are used in 4:8 (παραλαμβάνω), 17:1 (παραλαμβάνω and ἀναφέρω), and 28:16 (πορεύομαι). ὅτε ἔγγισαν at 21:1 is finite but functions as an introductory phrase like the participial uses, which in other cases are followed by finite verbs, as at 5:1 (ἰδῶν τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνέβη), 14:23 (ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνέβη), 15:29 (μεταβάς ... ἦλθεν ... ἀναβὰς ... ἐκάθητο), 24:3 (καθημένου ... προσῆλθον), and 26:30 (ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον).[1] There is no single grammatical form characteristic of this element of the narratives.

The contents are also varied. The account may mention the crowd (5:1, 14:23), the mere fact of departure from a previous scene or event (15:29), or the time or occasion of the present event (17:1, 21:1, 26:30). The description of motion to the mountain is diverse as well. ἀναβαίνω is used in three cases, all earlier in the gospel (5:1, 14:23, 15:29). παραλαμβάνω is used in 4:8 and 17:1. πορεύομαι is found at 28:16.[2] The Mount of Olives references present an interesting pattern in themselves: at 21:1, the gathering of Jesus and his disciples in Jerusalem, ἔρχομαι is used; at 24:3, during the stay in Jerusalem, προσέρχομαι is used; and at 26:30, just before the departure to events leading to the cross, ἐξέρχομαι is used.

---

[1] 17:1 is interesting when compared with 4:8. Since ἀναφέρω is sufficient to describe the ascent in 17:1, παραλαμβάνω is superfluous. It may be a literary connection between 17:1 and 4:8, perhaps for theological reasons. On the relation of the transfiguration to other mountain events from the theological point of view, see chapter three.

[2] Does Matthew avoid using a term implying "ascent" here in harmony with the disciples' mission to go into the world?

The description of the mountain seems to be more stylized. In most instances the article is used. Three times this is without further qualification (εἰς τὸ ὄρος , 5:1, 14:23, 15:29--all earlier mountains in Matthew); four specify the mountain in question (εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν , 21:1, 26:30; 24:3 uses ἐπί together with καθήμενος ; and 28:16 defines it as τὸ ὄρος οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς). The remaining two uses omit the article but use the term ὑψηλόν (εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν λίαν , 4:8; εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν , 17:1). Thus two groups of usages present themselves, one characterized by the use of the article, the other lacking the article but employing ὑψηλόν .

Formal features

(1) Statement of Circumstances (from context only at 4:8), all scenes
(2) Motion to mountain (but 24:3 has only the verb καθήμενος), all scenes.

(2) Situation on the Mountain

While 4:8, 17:1, 21:1, 26:30, and 28:16 pass directly to the event, the other scenes give a further description of the setting upon the mount. 14:23 is unique in that Jesus is quite alone. Despite the usual idea of the "solitary" Lord, retiring upon the mountain--a picture we derive from

Luke's presentation--Jesus in Matthew is almost always accompanied by others to the mountain. Even in 14:23 the solitary prayer is followed immediately by his aiding the disciples in the boat (14:23-33). And, while his aloneness is characterized by κατ' ἰδίαν in 14:23, the phrase also appears in contexts where several others are present as well (17:1, Jesus is on the mount with the "inner circle" of his disciples; 24:3, where we hear about the μαθηταί). Thus this "aloneness" does not really describe the number of participants, but their quality of separation from the world.[1]

We may point out one or two sub-patterns among the mountain narratives. If we arrange the three scenes in which κατ' ἰδίαν is used (14:23, 17:1, 24:3) in order we note that in the first Jesus is completely alone, in the second he is alone with the three intimate disciples, and in the third he is "alone" with the μαθηταί as a whole. Another important, though small-scale, pattern can be seen in 5:1, 15:29, and 24:3. Here Jesus is said to be "sitting" upon the mountain, and disciples, or the crowd, "come" to him. We will examine this in more detail in chapter three.

Formal features

(1) Jesus alone, 14:23
(2) Jesus καθημένος, the disciples or the crowd προσήλθον αὐτῷ, 5:1, 15:29, 24:3
(3) Lacking, 4:8, 17:1, 21:1, 26:30, 28:16

---

[1] The absence of κατ' ἰδίαν in 5:1, then, is perhaps an argument for the broader understanding of the audience of the Sermon. κατ' ἰδίαν, had it been used, would limit the Sermon to Jesus' disciples as over against the "world."

XUM

(3) Introduction to Action

In 15:29 and 17:1 action is reported before Jesus speaks or acts himself. In 4:8 the διάβολος has the first word, while Jesus reacts to others in 5:1, 15:29, and 24:3. The cases where Jesus' initiative seems to be clear are 21:1 and 26:30. The προσέρχομαι reported in 28:16 is interesting in that Jesus "comes" to the disciples; the other mountain uses of προσέρχομαι (5:1, 15:29, 24:3) show others coming to Jesus. This small but decisive reversal indicates a new initiative; the time for inquiry about and through Jesus is now past; he has been shown as Lord through the resurrection, and the disciples must witness to him in the world. It is with this charge that he "comes" to them.

When we speak of "action" on the mount, we often mean speech. The introduction usually concludes with Jesus "speaking" in commission or command. Typically we find λέγω , combined with another verb serving to define the speech (5:1, ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων ; 21:1, ἀπέστειλεν ... λέγων αὐτοῖς).

Formal features

(1) Jesus speaks, 5:1, 21:1, 24:3, 26:30
(2) Action, then Jesus speaks, 15:29, 17:1
(3) ὁ διάβολος speaks, 4:8
(4) Lacking, 14:23

(4) Action on the Mountain

This is extremely varied. The "cast of characters" includes Jesus alone (14:23), Jesus with the διάβολος (4:8), with a crowd (15:29), with the three disciples (17:1), with all the disciples (5:1, 21:1, 24:3, 26:30--but see 26:36-37), and with the "eleven" (28:16). A rough classification of the activities would have to include prayer (14:23), teaching (ethical and on order within the church, 5:1; apocalyptic, 24:3; on discipleship, 26:30; on mission activity, 28:16), miracle stories (15:29, healing and feeding of the multitude), preparation for passion week events (21:1), and legends (conflict, 4:8; revelation or epiphany-story, 17:1; aetiological material on baptism, 28:16).

Jesus appears as the authoritative leader in all cases. In 5:1 the people respond with amazement (7:28); in 15:29 Jesus heals, then calls his disciples to himself and initiates the feeding by his compassion for the crowd. The tone of authority is particularly clear in 17:1 and 28:16.

Formal features

(1) Jesus alone, 14:23
(2) Jesus commanding, or responding with authority, 5:1, 15:29, 17:1, 21:1, 28:16, 24:3
(3) Dialogue, 4:8 (conflict)

XUM

(5) Response to Action

This features in several mountain scenes. In 4:8 Matthew records the response of the διάβολος, and then of God. The crowd responds in 5:1 (7:28) and 15:29 (15:31). The feature is lacking, however, from 24:3 and 28:16. The type of response is varied. It ranges from denial of Jesus (26:33, 26:36ff., 26:47) to confusion (17:5,6) to acclamation (the crowd, 7:28, 15:31). The response to 21:1 is particularly interesting. The style is that of Old Testament narrative, in which God commands and the thing is done: "God said, 'Let x happen' . . . then x happened."[1] The response is not interested in the disciples' psychological reaction to Jesus' command, but only in the fact of the response, and that it completely fulfilled the terms of the command.[2]

Formal features

(1) Performance of command, 21:1
(2) Speech: the disciples (in a negative light), 17:1, 26:29
(3) Speech: the crowd (in a positive light), 5:1, 15:29
(4) Divine reaction, 4:8ff.
(5) No reaction, 24:3, 28:16 (but on the latter see note 2 below).

---

[1] For the pattern see, for example, the narrative from the creation story, Genesis 1:3 and passim.

[2] Is this a clue to the meaning of Matthew 28:16-20? For it is certainly striking that no response is indicated there. While this is sensible enough in 24:3, which is after all teaching for the disciples' future action, 28:16-20 commands them to act in the present. It is quite unthinkable that Jesus'--the Lord's--commands go unfulfilled. Perhaps then the fulfillment is implied by the form of the command itself.

(6) Conclusion to Action

This is lacking in most scenes. There are two instances, however, in which a scene ends with the theme of comfort and renewal. Thus 4:8ff. ends with Jesus being ministered to by angels. The transfiguration scene 17:1-9 is more elaborate. Jesus touches his disciples; the heavenly figures are removed; Jesus stands the three upon their feet (ἐγέρθητε in 17:7, though the action is not itself described); Jesus returns to his normal state. The latter particularly indicates that Matthew is thinking of "undoing" the transfiguration events one by one to prepare for the return to the world. This must be the reason for the omission of Mark 9:15, which implies that Jesus retained marks of the transfiguration even after his descent from the mountain.[1]

Formal features

(1) Renewal and comfort, 4:8
(2) Reversal of events, 17:1
(3) Marked by the crowd's response as wonder, 5:1 (7:28)
(4) Lacking, 14:23, 15:29, 21:1, 24:3, 26:30, 28:16

(7) Descent from the Mountain

It is striking that the descent is not a necessary feature of Matthew's mountain scenes.[2] It is not mentioned at all in 4:8 and 28:16. Sometimes we may consider the descent implied in the location of the

---

[1] Matthew's omission of this motif in 17:14-21 is extremely odd if his purpose was really to make Jesus parallel with Moses on Sinai in the transfiguration narrative. On this see chapter three.

[2] See the discussion above (pp. 65-67).

XUM

following scene in the narrative (for example, 14:25 after 14:23, 21:7 after 21:1, 15:39 after 15:29, 26:57 after 26:30, and 26:6 after 24:3). Other scenes, however, do not even use this device of implied continuity; in fact they break continuity by mentioning another context of events (for example, 4:12 following 4:8-11). As noted above, it is only at 8:1 and 17:9 that the descent is explicitly indicated, both times using the term καταβαίνω.[1]

These last are precisely the scenes which mention the ὄχλος encountered by Jesus upon his descent. This prompts the question whether there is a pattern among Matthew's handling of the ὄχλος in connection with his mountains. Although there is some ambiguity about the audience for the Sermon on the Mount--a matter we must consider again in chapter three--there is no doubt in 15:29ff. that the crowd is itself upon the mountain. This passage is unique in having the crowd as a protagonist. The ὄχλος appears at the beginning (15:29-30), middle (15:32), and end (15:39) of the unit 15:29-39. Since it is Matthew who has constructed the narrative from two separate accounts in Mark, we may credit him with this development of the crowd as protagonist. In 17:1 the crowd appears only at the end, considerably after the action upon the mountain (17:14). Here Matthew takes away Mark's interest in the crowd's reaction to Jesus, just as he removes the motif of Jesus retaining traces of the transfiguration itself. The transformation is for Matthew to remain strictly between Jesus and the disciples--until the appointed time (17:10-13).

---

[1] Again we encounter the fact that the descent is not mentioned explicitly in 28:16-20, though it is commanded. Perhaps from a literary point the purpose is to emphasize the role of the disciple--that is, the reader, who must himself actualize the command in his own life.

XUM

Occasionally the crowd functions in a negative way in the mountain scenes; thus Jesus ascends the mount in 14:23 in order to escape from them.

We may summarize the ὄχλος in relation to Matthew's mountains in this way. The ὄχλος functions as an audience in reaction in 5:1-8:1, as the reason for Jesus' ascent (negatively) in 14:23, as the protagonist in 15:29-39; and to all these the hostile crowd in 26:47 forms an ironic contrast. From this point on in Matthew the crowd is hostile, serving as the tool of the chief priests and elders (27:20). The Mount of Olives scene at 26:47 indicates a shift in Matthew's earlier presentation of the crowd as friendly, a presentation which has dominated not only the mountain scenes but also other narratives such as 4:25ff. and 9:36ff.

Formal features

(1) Descent implied by context, no crowd involved, 14:23
(2) Descent implied by context, crowd is involved, 15:29,39; 21:3,7; 24:3, 26:6; 26:30, 57
(3) Descent from the mountain is explicit; the crowd awaits at the bottom of the mount, 5:1, 8:1; 17:1, 14
(4) Lacking, 4:8, 28:16.

This concludes our examination of the formal elements of Matthew's mountain scenes. Part of our purpose was to illustrate in convincing detail the richness and variety of Matthew's material. Indeed, the reader may despair of finding any order whatever in this mass of data. We could hardly be further from the concise, regular form which is the ideal of the traditional form-critic. But we see this as a gain rather than a loss in

XUM

our understanding of Matthew's gospel. We are forced away from the study of self-contained, closed units which, so to speak, forced themselves upon Matthew, and toward the study of Matthew's creative development of certain recurring forms. So now we abandon entirely the search for a pre-existent "mountain form," and concentrate upon Matthew's handling of the various elements in his mountain scenes.

We begin with the observation that diversity of form does not exclude patterns crafted from the elements of various narratives. We want now to try an experiment in the detection of such patterns. Let us first attempt to set Matthew's mountain scenes in increasing order of formal complexity. The following table lists each of the scenes, together with its formal elements, in such an order. The arabic numerals refer to the headings under which these elements were discussed on pages 75-83 above.

I. 14:23, Prayer upon the Mount
  1. Circumstances, motion to the mountain
     καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους
     ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος κατ' ἰδίαν
  2. Setting on the mountain
     προσεύξασθαι
  3. Action (only implied)
     ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης μόνος ἦν ἐκεῖ

II. 28:16, The Mission Charge
  1. Motion to the mountain
     οἱ δὲ ἕνδεκα μαθηταὶ ἐπορεύθησαν
     εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, εἰς τὸ ὄρος
     οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς

2. Setting, 28:17
   καὶ ἴδοντες αὐτόν προσεκύνησαν
3. Introduction to action, 28:18
   καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
   ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς λέγων
4. Action (a pronouncement of Jesus)
   ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία...
   ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος

III. 21:1, Preparation for Passion Week

1. Circumstances, motion to the mountain
   καὶ ὅτε ἤγγισαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα...
   εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν
2. Setting
   τότε Ἰησοῦς ἀπέστειλεν δύο μαθητάς
3. Introduction to action
   λέγων αὐτοῖς
4. Action, 21:2
   A. Command πορεύεσθε εἰς τὴν κώμην
   B. Fulfillment πορευθέντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ
      καὶ ποιήσαντες καθὼς συνέταξεν
      αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς

IV. 24:3, Apocalyptic Teaching

1. Circumstances
   καθημένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρος...
2. Setting
   προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ κατ' ἰδίαν
   λέγοντες... εἰπὲ ἡμῖν ... τοῦ αἰῶνος
3. Introduction to action 24:3
   καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς
4. Action (teaching of Jesus)
   βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ· πολλοί γαρ...
6. Conclusion to Action, 26:1
   καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
   πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους

V. 4:8, The Final Temptation

1. Motion to the mountain
   πάλιν παραλαμβάνει αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος
   εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν λίαν
2. Setting
   καὶ δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας
   τοῦ κόσμου
3. Introduction to action, 4:9
   καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ
4. Action (debate)
   A. Statement ταῦτά σοι πάντα δώσω
   B. Counter-statement, 4:10 τότε λέγει αὐτῷ
   ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ὕπαγε σατανᾶ
5. Reaction, 4:11
   τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος
6. Conclusion
   καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελοι προσῆλθον καὶ
   διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.

VI. 5:1-8:1, The Sermon on the Mount

1. Circumstances, motion to the mountain
   Ἰδὼν δὲ ὄχλους ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος
2. Setting
   καὶ καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ προσῆλθαν αὐτῷ
   οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
3. Introduction to action, 5:2
   καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ
   ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς λέγων
4. Action (teaching), 5:3
   μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι
5. Reaction, 7:28
   καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
   τοὺς λόγους τούτους, ἐξεπλήσσοντο
   οἱ ὄχλοι
7. Descent from the mountain, 8:1
   καταβάντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους
   ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί

XUM

VII. 15:29, Healing and Feeding on the Mountain

1. Circumstances, motion to the mountain
   καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκείθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
   ἦλθεν παρὰ τὴν θαλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας,
   καὶ ἀναβὰς εἰς τὸ ὄρος
2. Setting
   ἐκάθητο ἐκεῖ
4. Action, 15:30-31
   - A. Setting καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί
   - B. Action καὶ ἐθεραπεύσεν αὐτούς
   - C. Reaction καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραήλ

4. Action, 15:32-38
   - A. Setting ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος
     τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτῶν
   - B. Introduction εἶπεν
   - C. Action σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον

7. Descent from the mountain (implied only)
   καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἐνέβη εἰς
   τὸ πλοίον, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς
   τὰ ὅρια Μαγαδάν.

VIII. 26:30, Mount of Olives and Gethsemane

1. Circumstances, motion to mountain
   καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν

First event, 26:30-35

3. Introduction to action, 26:31
   τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
4. Action, 26:31-35
   - A. Statement
     πάντες ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοὶ
   - B. Reaction, 26:35
     λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος· καὶ δέῃ με
     σὺν σοὶ ἀποθανεῖν, οὐ μή σε
     ἀπαρνήσομαι. ὁμοίως καὶ πάντες . . .

XUM

Second event, 26:36-46

1. Motion, 26:36 τότε ἔρχεται μετ' αὐτῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
   εἰς χωρίον λεγόμενον Γεθσημανί
3. Introduction to action
   καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς
4. Action, 26:36-46
   - A. Setting, 26:37
     καὶ παραλαμβανὼν τὸν Πέτρον κτλ.,
     ἤρξατο λεπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδομονεῖν
   - B. Introduction to action, 26:38
     τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς
   - C. Action (statement of Jesus)
     περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου ἕως θανάτου·
     μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε μετ' ἐμοῦ.
   - D. Reaction, 26:40-41
     καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς . . . .
   - E. Conclusion
     ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα
7. Departure, 26:46
   ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν· ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν ὁ
   παραδιδούς με.

Third event, 26:47-57

1. Circumstances, motion to the mountain
   καὶ ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἰδοὺ Ἰούδας...
   καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολύς
2. Setting, 26:48-49
   ὁ δὲ παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν
   αὐτοῖς σημεῖον λέγων...
4. Action 26:49-56
   - A. Judas' statement καὶ εὐθέως . . . εἶπεν
   - B. Jesus' reply, 26:50 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ...
   - C. Action (the sword incident), 26:51-54
   - D. Dialogue, 26:55 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ
     εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς ὄχλοις
7. Descent (implied only), 26:57
   οἱ δὲ κρατήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν
   ἀπήγαγόν πρὸς καϊφᾶν τὸν ἀρχιερέα...

IX. 17:1-9. The Transfiguration

1. Circumstances, motion to the mountain
    καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἓξ παραλαμβάνει
    ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον... καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς
    εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν.
2. Setting, 17:2
    καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν...
3. Introduction to action, 17:3
    καὶ ἰδοὺ ὤφθη αὐτοῖς Μ. καὶ Ἠλίας
    συλλαλοῦντες μετ' αὐτοῦ.
5. Reaction, 17:4-7
    A. Peter's reaction, 17:4
        ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ
    B. Divine reaction to Peter, 17:5
        ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἰδοὺ νεφέλη...
    C. The three disciples' reaction, 17:6
        καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ
        πρόσωπον αὐτῶν...
    D. Jesus' reaction to the three disciples, 17:7
        καὶ προσῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
        καὶ ἁψάμενος αὐτῶν εἶπεν...

6. Conclusion, 17:8
    ἐπάραντες δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμαὺς αὐτῶν,
    οὐδένα εἶδον εἰ μὴ αὐτὸν, Ἰησοῦν μονον.
7. Descent from the mountain, 17:9-14, Καὶ καταβαινόντων
    A. Introduction to action αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους...
        ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων...
    B. Dialogue (opening with a command of Jesus)
        1. Jesus' command μηδενὶ εἴπητε τὸ ὅραμα...
        2. The disciples' reply, 17:10
            καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ
            λέγοντες· τί οὖν οἱ γραμματεῖς...
        3. Jesus' reply, 17:11-12
            ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν·
            Ἠλίας μὲν ἔρχεται... ὑπ' αὐτῶν.
        4. The disciples now understand, 17:13
            τότε συνῆκαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι...

If we now review this material, three elements seem most essential to it. There must be an introductory statement including information on circumstances (for example, companions of Jesus, or an indication of time), and the fact of motion to the mountain (24:3 the only exception; and this is in the midst of a larger sub-pattern of mountain references, those to the Mount of Olives). There is then a further statement of the situation upon the mountain, which serves to introduce the events to happen there. Finally some action or event is described; this part, of course, shows great diversity. Speech is involved in every case except 14:23, sometimes *simpliciter* (5:1, 21:1, 24:3), sometimes with action attendant upon it (4:8, 15:29, 17:1, 26:30, 28:16). The events range from a simple continuation of the setting, as at 14:23, to the large complexes of 26:30ff. and 17:1ff. The simpler scenes do not even include the reaction to the events, or a descent from the mountain.

While we were frustrated in our attempts to find a concise "mountain form" embracing all these scenes, certain patterns do emerge on the larger view. The material on pages 84-89 above enables us to look at the whole body of Matthew's mountain scenes at once. Now I believe we can trace a logical process of expansion and development through this material. Scene I (14:23) has only location on the mount and a setting, with action implied. All scenes from II (28:16) include speech, whether a definitive statement of Jesus or dialogue. With scene III (21:1) we gain an indication of the reaction to Jesus' words, not yet in spoken form, but shown through the actions of the participants. Scene IV (24:3ff.) does not formally indicate the response, but we do have a conclusion to the action in Jesus' statement of 26:1-2 (where it takes the form appropriate to the conclusion of one of the discourses). Scene V (4:8) indicates both reaction and conclusion, together with more complex action, including statement and counter-statement. In scene VI (5:1) we pick up the descent motif, and the action is still more complex through the involvement of the crowd, an element external to the scene itself. With VII (15:29) we have two separate events upon the mountain, each with its own structure. VIII (26:30ff.) includes no less than three events upon the mountain, with motion indicated between the first and second. IX is more difficult to fit into this scheme. It has only one event upon the mountain; but this is highly complex, including several disparate motifs, and a descent which displays its own internal structure of action and reaction. It stands apart also in not recording any words of Jesus until very late in the account.

The process of expansion and development among Matthew's mountain scenes may be concisely summarized in the following way:

I.	14:23	has location and setting/action
II.	28:16	adds speech
III.	21:1	adds reaction to speech
IV.	24:3	no reaction; adds conclusion
V.	4:8	has both reaction and conclusion, together with complex action including statement and counter-statement
VI.	5:1	adds descent
VII.	15:29	adds a second event upon the mountain
VIII.	26:30	adds a third event upon the mountain
IX.	17:1	has one event upon the mountain, but of great complexity, together with descent including its own complex structure.

While the progression is not perfect in every detail, there is basically

XUM

an orderly and logical development in formal complexity. And, generally speaking, the elements in each numbered scene are retained in later scenes. If our examination of individual elements in Matthew's mountain scenes threatens despair for the traditional form-critic, this result keeps us from hastening to the opposite extreme, and denying all formal structure whatever to the mountain scenes in Matthew. For this is not a picture of formal anarchy.

Let us now try another experiment. Let us assume that there is a mountain "form" behind the scenes we have just surveyed. On a priori grounds we would expect it to contain the following elements:

(1) a statement of motion to the mountain, probably including some indication of circumstances, or other connection with the context
(2) a description of the scene or setting upon the mountain
(3) an action or event upon the mountain, including an introduction, the action itself, and an indication of the response to the event
(4) the descent from the mountain.

We have drawn up this scheme from the abstract notion of what such a narrative would "require." Since Matthew was not working in the abstract, but with source materials plus his own literary craftsmanship and theological intentions, it is not surprising that none of his mountain scenes conforms precisely to this ideal scheme. But if we consider Matthew's "deficiencies" from the hypothetical form, an interesting result emerges. Each of the above formal elements will be considered in its turn.

(1) Motion and Circumstances

An indication of motion to the mountain is lacking in 24:3. But Matthew's interest is in the continuity from 24:1-2 to 24:3bff. He is concerned about the details of the apocalyptic events already predicted in 24:1-2. He also wants to place the scene upon the Mount of Olives; he is however not interested in the ascent, but in the speech by Jesus as the answer to the disciples' questions in 24:1-2. In 4:8 we find another such "deficiency," an absence of indications of the time or circumstances of the ascent. But this is quite unnecessary since the temptation narrative as a whole supplies the context. An indication of circumstances is also lacking in 28:16. But the problem arises only from the insertion of 28:11-15, the rebuttal to the Jewish tale about Jesus' body having been stolen from the tomb. The continuity is from 28:10 to 28:16; and 28:10 provides the circumstances for the disciples' ascent of the mount in Galilee in 28:16. Thus the lack of this formal feature may in each case be explained on literary grounds, whether context (4:8) or the insertion of other material (28:11-15, 24:3a).

(2) Setting on the Mountain

Only two scenes lack this feature. The bare formula of command and fulfillment is present in 21:1. Matthew's interest is in the disciples' action as fulfillment of their Lord's commands, not in the logistics or the geography of the situation.[1] The feature is also lacking in 26:30. Here Matthew seems content to follow a firm tradition (compare this with

---

[1] On this see the discussion on p. 80 above.

XUM

Mark 14:26-27 and Luke 22:39) which also lacked it.

(3) Action upon the Mountain

Only 14:23 omits this feature; and even here the action of Jesus is clearly indicated in the introduction to the account. The lack of speech is hardly surprising in Matthew's only account of Jesus alone upon the mountaintop.

(4) The Descent from the Mountain

The "deficiencies" in this category are particularly interesting. For example, the lack of an explicit descent in 14:23 can be accounted for by Matthew's literary intentions. Jesus' appearance in 14:25 is a miraculous appearance. The dramatic effect of this is heightened by the absence of a statement to the effect that Jesus descended the mountain of 14:23. His appearance is all the more impressive for want of an explanation of "how he got there"; and all Matthew's interest is devoted to Jesus' sudden appearance as his response to the need and danger of the disciples. Ideal form is sacrificed for dramatic effect. The same may be said for 4:8ff. Theologically this marks the end of the first stage of Jesus' life. Immediately after, he begins his public ministry (4:12). Matthew ends the account of his preparation on a note of glorious climax: the devil vanquished, Jesus is ministered to by angels sent from God; he stands in triumph upon the mountain. It may help if we imagine this being dramatized upon the stage. An imaginative director, sensitive to Matthew's theological and literary intentions, would show Jesus bathed in light upon the mountain as he replies to Satan. Then the lights would suddenly be cut, leaving the stage in total darkness. The audience would retain the powerful image of Jesus triumphant. This image would serve as a mental backdrop throughout the rest of the play; our whole view of Jesus' ministry would be colored by the single impression. Such is Matthew's intention, realized by literary means; once again, an explicit mention of the descent would only detract from the effect.

It may be that this provides a clue to the end of the gospel as well. We are left with the dramatic image of Jesus upon the mountain, this time with his disciples, as he magisterially commands them to make disciples of the "nations." This should be dramatized in the same way: the scene bathed in glorious light, then the theater plunged into sudden darkness. The viewer is left with the powerful impression of majesty, which gives weight to the commission which he is now to perform. Thus the ministry of Jesus ends precisely as it began, with the impression of Jesus in majesty. And the reader is now under the command-fulfillment formula we have already seen in another mountain scene, 21:1.[1] Jesus has commanded; we must obey at once. It is in this sense, of course, that there is a descent from the mountain of 28:16-20, and it is revealed in the "go therefore" of 28:19. The reader himself is to provide the descent; indeed, in performing our charge we are bringing Christ into the world. Theologically, then, there is a descent, but it happens after the close of Matthew's book. As Jesus is not the recluse upon the mountain in

---

[1] Where the absence of an explicit descent is explained by the command-fulfillment formula itself. See pp. 80 and 93 above. One could say of course that the descent is implicit in 21:6.

Matthew's gospel, so does the church not linger there after his death. As we shall see in the next chapter, its business is elsewhere.

This completes our examination of the apparent "deficiencies" in Matthew's mountain scenes. The real question is whether it is Matthew, or our hypothetical mountain "form," which is deficient. We have been able to show with reasonable certainty that a "deficiency" in formal structure may be traced to a literary or theological intention. To "improve" the form would usually be to weaken the theological or dramatic intention behind the text.

Ten years ago one would have quickly assumed from this that a "mountain form" did in fact exist, which Matthew had altered in various ways for maximum literary effectiveness, or with an eye to his theology. Today we are more aware of the independent creative power of an author such as Matthew, and less ready to find in the background a "form" which, in fact, we never see in its original state. Indeed the hypothetical form posited on page 92 describes nothing more nor less than the common-sense requirements of a story which takes place upon a mountain: the participants have to go up and come down, and presumably something has to happen on top! We do not consider, then, that we have discovered a form in the traditional form-critical sense of the term, that is, a controlling pattern of events which was prior to Matthew's activity. We do believe this demonstrates a "form" in another sense, as a general pattern for events which occur upon a mountain, a pattern existing probably only in Matthew's own mind, and there perhaps only at the common-sense or intuitive level. Certainly this pattern was very flexible; Matthew felt complete freedom to deviate from it, whether from loyalty to his tradition (26:30), or from his own development of the tradition (15:29, 28:16). It was an enabling, rather than a constricting, piece of mental furniture. And considering the rigidity of some forms offered us by form-critics, we may well prefer Matthew's approach.

The Seven Mountains and the Structure of Matthew's Gospel

Thus far we have considered Matthew's mountain scenes as a body of texts, searching for patterns among them. Now we must consider them in relation to Matthew's gospel as a whole. What connections can we draw between the seven mountains and the gospel? Since there are precisely seven mountains, an obvious place to begin is material arranged according to numerical groups in Matthew's work. These have already received some attention, primarily in their role as didactic and catechetical devices.[1] The most prominent grouping is by fives: the division into five discourses and, possibly, five "books" paralleling the five books of the Torah.[2] For some, patterns of three are most significant;[3] Rigaux mentions patterns of two as well.[4] Other patterns of seven in Matthew

---

[1] Beda Rigaux, Témoignage de l'évangile de Matthieu (Paris: Brouwer, 1967), pp. 46ff., speaks of them as "une méthode mnemotechnique à l'usage des catéchètes."

[2] The classic development of this is found in Benjamin W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1930). The most recent example of its fruitfulness is in the new work of Norman Perrin, The New Testament: An Introduction (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich, 1974), pp. 177-90.

[3] For example, Allen, Commentary, p. xxii.

[4] Rigaux, Témoignage, p. 46.

XUM

have been neglected. Hawkins, tracing evidence of "numerical arrangement in Matthew," does not mention the number.[1] When groups of seven are discussed, they are usually groupings of like features within a single narrative, such as the seven petitions claimed in the Lord's Prayer (6:9-13), seven parables discovered in Matthew 13, seven elements within the unit 6:25-34, and seven woes delivered against the Pharisees (23:13-25).[2] Or the seven-fold elements of certain texts may be mentioned, such as the seven loaves and seven baskets of left-overs (15:34-37), seven demons (12:45), seven brothers (22:25), and the requirement to forgive not seven times, but seventy times seven (18:22).[3]

Occasionally seven has figured in efforts to determine the structure of Matthew's gospel as a whole. Already Bacon analysed it into seven parts in connection with the development of the five-fold discourse scheme.[4] Another outline, with more attention to literary structure and

---

[1] John C. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Clarendon Press, 1909), pp. 163ff.

[2] See for example Allen, Commentary, p. xliv; Rigaux, Témoignage, pp. 46ff.; Paul Gaechter, Literarische Kunst im Matthäus-Evangelium (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, n.d.), pp. 13ff. The grouping of seven mountains does not seem to have been realized earlier. J. C. Fenton, The Gospel of St. Matthew, Pelican Gospel Commentaries (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1963), p. 245, lists mountain references but omits 21:1, 24:3, and 26:30. Allen, Commentary, p. xxii, lists some "groups of seven" in the gospel but does not include the mountains among them. So far as I can tell the seven-fold pattern of mountains has been overlooked.

[3] Rigaux, Témoignage, p. 46.

[4] Bacon, Studies; the outline is also available in Filson, Commentary, p. 22.

XUM

adopted by Gaechter, also features seven parts.[1] Filson presents no less than three possible outlines, none of which he considers entirely satisfactory.[2] Two of the three have seven parts. There is a striking variety among these various outlines, and it becomes all the more apparent if we try to relate our scheme of seven mountains to the structure of the gospel as a whole. In the table below we present the location of the mountain scenes in Matthew in each of four different outlines of the gospel:

Section	Gaechter/Cladder	Filson I	Filson II	Filson III
(1)	4:8			
(2)	5:1	4:8, 5:1	4:8	4:8
(3)			5:1	5:1, 14:23, 15:29
(4)	14:23, 15:29		14:23, 15:29, 17:1	17:1
(5)	17:1	14:23, 15:29, 17:1		21:1, 24:3, 26:30
(6)	21:1, 24:3, 26:30	21:1, 24:3, 26:30	21:1, 24:3, 26:30	28:16
(7)	28:16	28:16	28:16	

There is no single section in which all of the outlines agree. Such variety can only make it very doubtful whether any outline would bring Matthew's mountains into a neat pattern. Of course we might construct an

---

[1] Gaechter, Matthäus, pp. 16-17. The scheme was originally developed according to Gaechter by H. Cladder. On p. 17 we have: "Auf jeden Fall verleiht die organisierte Siebenheit auch dem mit Mt als Ganzen eine geschlossene Form." The structure is summarized briefly in Gaechter, Literarische Kunst, p. 13.

[2] Filson, Commentary, gives a presentation and an interesting discussion of the difficulties in this type of analysis; see particularly pp. 21-24.

XUM

outline of our own, based upon the mountain scenes as its structural principle. This would be unsatisfactory from a methodological point of view; we would be forcing the material in a predetermined mould. The division of one mountain per section would require us to place 14:23 and 15:29 in different divisions. There appears to be no warrant in the text for a division between them.

While there is a good possibility, then, that Matthew developed his gospel in seven sections, this seven-fold division does not seem to be related directly to the seven mountains. These are not the structural principle of Matthew's gospel as a whole in the traditional literary sense. They do not define the various sections of his work; nor, as we saw above, are they all linked by a consistent pattern of introductory phrases or other literary devices.

Now there are, of course, other structural principles claimed for Matthew's gospel, and it may be that the mountains are related to one or more of these. Probably the most familiar is the division into five "discourses" to which we have referred above. While the significance of this division may be disputed, the fact of the division itself is a matter of empirical observation.[1] Let us set these five discourses against the seven mountain scenes. This may be done in the following manner:

---

[1] For example, the argument over whether this represents the Torah--and to what extent typology is developed from the Old Testament--does not affect the existence of the literary phenomena marking the five-fold discourse structure in Matthew's gospel.

Discourse	Mountain
	1. 4:8
1. 5:1-7:28	2. 5:1
2. 10:1-11:1	
3. 13:1-13:52	
	3. 14:23
	4. 15:29
	5. 17:1
4. 18:1-19:1	
5. 24:3-26:1	6. 21:1, 24:3, 26: 30
	7. 28:16

A certain structure is apparent here. The first and last mountains precede and follow the first and last discourses. The second and sixth mountains are the setting for the first and last discourses. The third, fourth, and fifth mountains stand together between the third and fourth discourses. We cannot prove that Matthew created this pattern deliberately, but it is suggestive that mountains 1, 2, and 7 above, which maintain this pattern, are all Matthean additions to his material. He may at least have intended to create the structure of beginning and ending discourses and mountain events:

Discourse	Mountain
	1. 4:8
1. 5:1-7:28	2. 5:1
. . . .	. . . . .
5. 24:3-26:1	6. 21:1, 24:3, 26:30
	7. 28:16.

Matthew has also developed a certain geographical structure in his gospel. It may be fruitful to compare this with the scheme of seven mountains. We place the elements side-by-side once again:

Geographical location of events in Matthew	Mountains
1. Judea, 1:1-4:11	1. 4:8
2. Galilee, 4:12-19:1	2. 5:1 3. 14:23 4. 15:29 5. 17:1
(Journey to Judea, 19:1b-20:34)	
3. Judea, 21:1-28:15	6. 21:1, 24:3, 26:30
4. Galilee, 28:16-20	7. 28:16
5. The world, after the conclusion of the gospel![1]	

Matthew may have intended to integrate his mountain scenes into the geographical structure of the gospel. Once again the mountains stand at the beginning and end of the other divisions. Each geographical division has at least one such scene. Apart from the first case, where the mountain marks the end of the division (4:8-11), the mountain is placed at (21:1, 28:16) or very near (5:1) the beginning of the division. The bulk of the mountain scenes occur in the first Galilean section, consistent with Matthew's view of Jesus as a Galilean figure: the bulk of the ministry is conducted there, and in the return to Judea (21:1-28:15) there is still an emphasis upon Jesus "going forward" to Galilee, to meet his disciples once again.[2] We are not in a position to prove that Matthew deliberately created these correspondences. But it is suggestive that the first and seventh mountains are both Matthean creations. For if we assume that the tradition originally pictured Jesus as working in Galilee, then Jerusalem, so that Matthew himself is responsible for the initial Judean material in his gospel, as well as the closing appearance in Galilee, then it appears that he has added a mountain for each of these additional parts of Jesus' career.

---

[1] On the possible theological significance of this command to "go down" from the mountain, see the treatment of 28:16-20 in chapter three.

[2] The contrast with John the Baptist as a Judean figure has often been noted.

Another interesting structural device in Matthew is his use of ἀναχωρέω. This must be considered a "Matthean" term, as he supplies more than half of all the New Testament usages of it. There are seven uses of the term with reference to Jesus himself: 2:13, 2:14, 2:22, 4:12, 12:15, 14:13, and 15:21. These all describe Jesus' response to threatening situations, but by no means do they indicate a "strategic retreat" on Jesus' part. For Jesus suffers no reverses in Matthew's gospel. It would be more accurate to describe them as a voluntary "change of venue" for Jesus' own advantage. Thus the withdrawal from Judea leads directly to the beginning of his ministry, in Galilee (4:12-17). The mountain does not seem to be related to this pattern. There seems to be no literary connection between the withdrawals at 4:12, 14:12, and 15:29 and the mountains of 4:8, 14:23, and 15:29 respectively. More importantly, the ascent of the mountain is never described as an ἀναχωρέω.[1] In fact the mountain is one of the few places to which Jesus does not

---

[1] The other pole is Luke, who has Jesus retiring to the mountain frequently for prayer. But of course Luke does not see this as a forced retreat any more than does Matthew.

XUM

"withdraw."[1]

Once again our investigations yield mixed results. We cannot claim that Matthew has built the structure of his gospel upon the pattern of mountain scenes. But we do find evidence that he has related them to other important patterns in his work, particularly the discourses and the geographical structure of the gospel, showing in each case a special interest in the opening and the closing part of the book.

This prompts the question whether the mountain scenes connected with these patterns show special relationships among themselves. We wish to approach this through another survey of the mountain scenes in Matthew's gospel. Here our concern is not so much with features of form as with literary relationships--introductory words, verbs of motion, and the like. Our goal is to locate specific linguistic units shared by various mountain narratives. The listing of passages is followed by citation of those terms which they share. We have attempted also to indicate cross-correspondences by placing in parentheses features which one or more of the passages within a category shares with passages outside that category:

(1) Passages showing several points of agreement

A. 4:8, 17:1 παραλαμβάνω
εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν (λίαν)
λέγω (Jesus at 4:10, 17:7, 17:9)
These are the only uses of παραλαμβάνω and of εἰς ὄρος without the article in Matthew's mountain scenes (see [8] below).

---

[1] In fact the withdrawals are to Egypt (2:13,14), to Galilee (4:12), εἰς ἔρημον τόπον (4:13), to Tyre and Sidon (15:21), and ἐκείθεν --from the synagogue--(12:15).

XUM

B. 21:1. 24:3. 26:30 ἔρχομαι, προσέρχομαι, ἐξέρχομαι
εἰς τὸ ὄρος,
(14:23, 17:1, 24:3 κατ' ἰδίαν)
(24:3, 5:1, 15:29 καθίζω and προσέρχομαι)
(21:1, 26:30 λέγω : 24:3 εἶπεν)

C. 5:1. 14:23. 15:29 ἀναβαίνω
εἰς τὸ ὄρος
(5:1, 15:29, 24:3 προσέρχομαι and καθίζω)
(5:1, 15:29 λέγω : lacking in 14:23)

(2) Passages showing a single, but striking, point of agreement

D. 14:23. 17:1. 24:3 κατ' ἰδίαν

There is an interesting succession in these scenes. In 14:23, Jesus is alone; in 17:1, with the three chief disciples; in 24:3 with "the disciples."

E. 5:1-8:1. 17:1-17:9
5:1 ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος
8:1 καταβάντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους

17:1 καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν
17:9 καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους

These are, as we have noted, the only scenes indicating explicitly both ascent and descent of the mountain.

F. 21:1. 28:16
πορεύομαι

At 21:1; this is also the command of Jesus to his disciples in 28:19.

G. 5:1. 15:29. 24:3
καθίζω, προσέρχομαι
(5:1, 15:29, 17:7, 24:3, 28:16 προσέρχομαι)
(4:8, 15:29, 24:3 εἶπεν , in 4:8 it refers to the διάβολος)

(3) Passages showing striking disagreement from others

H. 4:8, 17:1 εἰς ὄρος (ὑψηλόν)

(Against 5:1, 14:23, 15:29, 21:1, 24:3, 26:30, 28:16 which have other characterizations of the mountain: τῶν ἐλαιῶν 21:1, 24:3, 26:30; οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, 28:16)

I. 17:7, 28:18

Jesus προσέρχεται the disciples

(Against C above--5:1, 15:30, 24:3--in which the disciples, or the crowd, "comes" to Jesus)

J. 4:8, 15:29, 24:3 εἶπεν[1]

(Against 4:10, 5:1, 17:5, 17:9, 21:1, 26:30, and 28:16 which use λέγω)

(5:1, 15:29, 24:3 προσέρχομαι and καθίζω)
(5:1, 15:29, 17:7, 24:3, 28:16 προσέρχομαι).

We may add a summary classification of the mountains according to the kind of events which occur upon them:

(1) Temptation, 4:8
(2) Teaching
    A. Church order, discipleship, 5:1
    B. Apocalyptic, 24:3
(3) Prayer, 14:23, 26:30ff.
(4) Miracles, healing and feeding, 15:29ff.
(5) Commissioning, 28:16, also 21:1[2]
(6) Transfiguration, 17:1

If we survey this material, paying due attention to the cross-correspondences indicated in parentheses, two apparently contradictory results emerge. There are on the one hand clear indications of intentional patterns. There are on the other continuous interactions among different patterns: a given scene may be operative in several patterns at the same time. Thus every pattern is literally "pulled apart" by its own members, in their relationships with other patterns. This reminds us of the results of our form-critical investigations. We do find order, but too many different orderings to determine any single, unifying scheme. It is particularly interesting to compare the above material with our structural studies on pages 100-104. The mountains at 4:8, 5:1, and 28:16--all Matthean creations--were found to be significant in establishing patterns related to the five discourses and to the geographical structure of Matthew's gospel. But a review of the literary similarities as shown on pages 104-106 reveals that no such classification includes more than one of these three passages. In other words, these passages, so significant for the structure of Matthew's gospel as a whole, are not related by any single literary device. Now there is no literature without order, but Matthew is working on several levels of order all at once. It is almost as though he were developing several related but independent schemes of structure and literary correspondence at the same time. Nothing could be further from the artificial orderliness of the "compiler."

---

[1] Strictly speaking, εἶπεν is used in 4:9. We are here following Nestle against KWΘpl, which read λέγει.

[2] On 28:16-20 as the "commissioning" of the disciples see chapter three.

The Composition of Matthew's Seven Mountains

We have frequently spoken of a "scheme" of seven mountains in Matthew's gospel. "Scheme" implies order; but so far we have not been able to find an ordering principle which encompasses all the mountain scenes. Perhaps the pattern was suggested to Matthew from another source, a text outside the synoptic tradition completely. We want now to survey the most likely possibilities for such a source. In this we are not so much concerned with typological or theological connections as with literary and structural parallels which may have provided Matthew with a clue for his work.

The number seven is significant in the Old Testament as a stylized number of elements within one context.[1] For example, there are seven altars and seven sacrifices in Numbers 23:1, and Elijah looks seven times for rain (I Kings 18:43).[2] Occasionally seven events do happen upon a mountain, as in the last instance. But Old Testament usage of the seven-fold pattern must be distinguished from the type of structural intention visible in Matthew's seven mountains. For the Old Testament knows of "seven" only as the number of elements or motifs within a single story; with Matthew the seven mountains play a structural role in the gospel as a whole, spanning Jesus' ministry from its beginning to its ending.[3] It is their usage through the length of a single large literary unit that makes them distinctive.

---

[1] On this see especially Marvin H. Pope, "Seven, Seventh, and Seventy," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible IV: 294-95, and also Theodore H. Gaster, Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 305.

[2] See also II Kings 5:10, II Kings 5:14, Joshua 6:4, 15, I Kings 8:29-53, Exodus 29:35-37, Genesis 7:2, 8:20, 21:28-30, Numbers 28:11, Leviticus 4:6, Ezekiel 40:22, Exodus 25:31-37, I Kings 7:49, Zechariah 4:2,11, II Samuel 21:6, 9, Judges 6:13, 19, Genesis 4:24, Proverbs 6:31, Daniel 4:16, Ezekiel 9:2, Zechariah 4:10b, for example.

[3] The distinction is between several levels or types of structural arrangement. Perhaps indeed the large and complex structure of every great work of literature has grown from the seed of the "repeated motif" which occurs in every folklore. On this problem of levels of structure see the discussion below.

Matthew's structure is also distinguished from that of extra-Biblical writers. One may certainly point to significant mountains in the works of Josephus, Philostratus, and Philo.[1] But we have not been able to find a sequence of mountains arranged throughout a single narrative, in a structurally significant way.

Among the intertestamental literature one thinks naturally of Jubilees because of the importance of the number seven in that work. The "mountain" is indeed the setting for the work (Prologue, 1:1ff.); but that seems to be its only significance. The importance of the mountain in other intertestamental literature lies in the field of motif-study.[2] The most promising text is I Enoch 17-36, where at last we find a mention of seven mountains. Chapters 17-28 are especially fruitful; we find seven stars "like mountains burning" (19:3), a mountain stretching up to heaven (17:2), a mountain "burning" (21:3), three mountains (22:1, 26:1ff.), and various mountains (28:1). The themes of seven and mountains coincide at 24:1ff., the "seven magnificent mountains" (cf. also 19:3, 21:3, 22:1), with the seventh mountain standing in the center like a throne.[1] But these seven mountains belong to the world of apocalyptic imagery--and apocalyptic theology if they indeed refer to Jerusalem[2]--rather than structure. They form within themselves one discrete motif, and do not serve to unify a continuous narrative.[3] Furthermore, there are few grounds for ascribing a direct influence of I Enoch upon Matthew.[4]

---

[1] For Josephus see *Antiquities* 3.76, 95, Moses' ascent of Sinai; 4. 323, Moses' death; 8. 348, Elijah's withdrawal to Carmel. From Philostratus see *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 4. 23, describing the momentous visit of Apollonius to the most important mountain in Greece. Philo deals with the mountain in *Questions and Answers on Exodus* 2. 40, on Exodus 24:12a, and on this compare 2. 45. See also *Life of Moses* 2. 69ff., on Moses' ascent of Sinai, and 2. 288, on Moses' death.

[2] The mountain as the throne of God, I Enoch 25:3, 5; with reference to Jerusalem (=Zion) in I Enoch 26:24, IV Ezra 13:35, Jubilees 8:19--the last two featuring three mountains; as the seat of "the Man," IV Ezra 13:6; as the scene of a vision, Testament of Levi 2:5ff., 7:4, 8:1. The final reference is aimed at Bethel; on this cf. Genesis 12:8.

Thus we are driven back to Matthew's own work itself for an understanding of the scheme of seven mountains which we find there. We have found no close parallels in the other gospels, nor in extra-Biblical literature. Nor are other groupings and structures in Matthew's gospel able to provide the solution. For the mountains are neither a single, seven-fold element within one tradition (such as at 22:25, 18:22), nor a structural device within one particular literary unit (such as at 13:13-23). They represent events occurring throughout Matthew's long book and linked together by their common setting upon the mountain. In addition, the mountain scenes cannot adequately be understood through conventional critical methods. They cannot be encompassed within one or two form-critical categories. Nor are they unified by consistent literary devices such as key phrases. Rather they are marked by a puzzling combination of consistency and diversity. The frustration of traditional critical methods is that one can cut the cake in so many different ways. Indeed the only factors common to all seven mountains in Matthew seem to be the mountain setting itself and their concentration upon Jesus.

---

[1] Noted by Riesenfeld, Jesus, p. 220. But he does not discuss a possible connection of the numerical aspect of these mountains with the transfiguration account, much less to Matthew's gospel as a whole. His interest is in the mountain as a feature of Jewish apocalyptic imagery.

[2] According to Joachim Jeremias, Golgotha (Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1926), p. 52. This may be of considerable importance for Matthew's theology; it will be discussed in chapter three.

[3] Indeed it could be said they convey the impression of chaotic exhuberance, of the apocalyptic hope exceeding the bounds of structure.

[4] The parallels given in R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Clarendon Press, 1913), vol. 2: Pseudepigrapha, pp. 180-81, are quite general.

We believe that we can discern here a new type of structural arrangement which is, so far as we know, unique in our literature. It stands midway between two extreme types of structural arrangement, which we may call the "discrete" and the "conceptual."

In the discrete approach to structure, unification is achieved through repetition of like or similar material. Often identical or closely similar wording is used each time; but the material may be linked by performing a similar function in the narrative. The repetition may operate at several levels of complexity. At the lowest is repetition within a single story unit, for example, the requirement to forgive not seven times, but seventy times seven (18:22). One might even question whether this has any structural significance; since there is no reference outside the unit itself one might prefer to consider it only a "folkloristic" motif, giving a certain fulness to the command. At the next higher level we find repetition which does contribute to the structure of the pericope. In the conflict-story concerning the seven brothers (22:23ff.) we not only hear of seven brothers, but the components are introduced in sequence: we hear of the first brother, then the second and third, and so on "down to the seventh." Thus the seven elements play their role in the dramatic development of the story; we experience their progression in our hearing or reading of the narrative. A still higher level of complexity occurs when the repeated material is stretched out over several stories. Here the unification is achieved not within one pericope, but among several parts of a longer narrative. The Markan Sammelberichte at 1:14 and 3:7-12 may serve as an example. Each report marks the transition from one phase of Jesus' ministry to another. They are linked to one another by their common function in the narrative. Another Marcan example is perhaps the geographical notices such as 1:14, 1:21, 1:39, 2:13, 3:7b-19, 6:2, 6:7, 6:30.[1] The chief example of this type of structure in Matthew is the familiar pattern of the five discourses, each clearly indicated by the literary device of a characteristic concluding formula. Thus at the lowest and highest level, the discrete approach to structure operates through the repetition of similar material, as shown by characteristic wording or function.

At the other extreme we find conceptual structure. This operates not by means of literary devices such as similar wording, or through functional parallels, but through concepts and ideas. We are no longer concerned with the motifs at work in this or that passage, but with material repeated on such a scale, and in so many contexts, that it must be called a "theme" of the work as a whole. This type of structuring is characteristic of the gospel of John. It explains why commentators may say that light, for example, is a concept which "pervades the gospel," and why a writer such as C. K. Barrett can say that "the words 'life' and 'light' are among the most characteristic of the gospel."[1] Now the references to φῶς are not unified by the literary methods we found characteristic of discrete structure. Yet there is such a feeling of consistency among the passages, arising from their expression of the same conceptual universe, that Bultmann could claim to have identified an original "φῶς-discourse" which has been divided up and disarranged in the gospel as it now stands.[2] It is typical of conceptual structure that it gains in effectiveness through association of ideas. Thus in John 1:4-9 and 12:46 the φῶς is identified with Jesus. In 3:19-21 φῶς is used to express the judgment of God which comes upon the world to the extent that it does not acknowledge Jesus as lord. Although φῶς does not occur in the gospel after 12:46, it is so related to the person of Jesus, and to our response to him, that it can never be far from our thoughts even in the latter part of the gospel. Such concepts also enter into combinations of ideas, such as the contrasting association of φῶς and σκοτία. Each concept increases the effectiveness of the other, and together they give a powerful visual imagery to the language of judgment and decision which encompasses the gospel.

---

[1] C. H. Dodd, "The Framework of the Gospel Narrative," now in New Testament Studies (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), pp. 1-11. Dodd sought to isolate these as headings in an outline of Jesus' ministry, and from them to extract an account--prior to Mark--of the course of that ministry. It was originally intended as a salvo against Karl L. Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1919). Whatever one thinks of the theory itself, the references do provide a certain geographical structure to the gospel. The relation of this geography to the actual map of Palestine has nothing to do with its reality as a literary device present in Mark's gospel.

---

[1] C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (London: S.P.C.K., 1955), p. 131.

[2] Rudolf Bultmann, The Gospel of John, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, gen. ed., R.W.N. Hoare, and J.K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), p. 399, n. 1. The discourse, he claimed, consisted of 8:12, 12:44-50, 9:5, 9:4, 11:9,10, and 12:35,36.

Matthew's mountains stand between these two extreme types of structure.[1] They are related to the discrete in that they indicate a place rather than an independent idea or concept. They play some structural role in the gospel: the prologue to Jesus' ministry ends with a mountain scene (4:8), the public ministry opens with teaching upon a mountain (5:1), the mountain unifies much of the passion week narrative (21:1, 24:3, 26:30), and the book ends with a mountain scene (28:16). The mountains are also related in some way to Matthew's scheme of five discourses, and to the geographical arrangement of the work. Yet we have moved beyond the discrete approach to structure. There is no single literary device linking all the mountains together and, while there are sub-groups of mountain scenes which share common features, we find almost a chaos of cross-references among the various sub-groups themselves. Nor do the mountains perform the same function in each case. And there is great variety among the scenes both in form and in content.

The only things linking the mountain scenes as a whole are their occurrences upon a mountain and their inclusion of Jesus. Thus we might speak of a picture of Jesus upon the mountain which unifies these scenes.

---

[1] For the original suggestion that the mountains might be related to some larger structural purpose in Matthew or other gospels I am indebted to Professor A. Henrichs. The development of this possibility is my own, however.

XUM

To this extent we are driven toward a conceptual understanding of structure. But Matthew does not develop a clear or consistent single concept through the mountain scenes, for example the presentation of Jesus "in majesty" upon the mount. The most we can say is that Matthew displays Jesus upon the mountain in almost all the characteristic activities of his ministry--in prayer, teaching, withstanding temptation, healing, feeding the multitude, commissioning, and in his authentication as God's agent. None of these activities is confined to the mountain; but the mountain is the only place in which they are all displayed. The mountain is a locus for Jesus' characteristic activities in Matthew's gospel.

But this is far short of the conceptual structuring we find in John's gospel. The mountain is important as the location of Jesus' activity, but not in itself. It does not represent or "stand for" Jesus; Jesus is never identified with it, and it does not enter into combination with other themes or images in the gospel of Matthew, as does φῶς in that of John. The mountain reveals aspects of Jesus' work; it is not a "theme" pervading the gospel.

Perhaps we are now in a better position to detect the source of Matthew's scheme of seven mountains. For there are certain similarities between the overall structure of seven mountains and the sub-structure of the three Mount of Olives references. We saw earlier that 21:1, 24:3, and 26:30 define a mountain-tradition shared closely by Mark and (with some differences) by Luke. The references unify the first part of passion week, up to the point of Jesus' arrest. His activities within

XUM

this time begin and end upon the mountain, and he returns to the mountain in the midst of the week for an important discourse. There are signs of literary unification of the accounts, particularly in the verbs of motion used and in the presence of the disciples in each case. Perhaps Matthew drew upon this example of the mountain scenes unifying a larger narrative unit in developing his pattern of seven mountains throughout the gospel as a whole. It is striking that Jesus' activities upon the mountains are varied in each case. He commissions (21:1), teaches (24:3), and retires for prayer (26:30ff.). It is precisely this variety of activities, unified by the two facts of Jesus' presence and the setting upon the mountain, which we have found in Matthew's seven mountains. Perhaps, then, taking the Mount of Olives references from the tradition as his inspiration, Matthew wrote his larger work, giving to the seven mountains a similar role, but one on a much larger scale. He added mountains to begin and end Jesus' public ministry, and to end Jesus' preparation for the ministry to Israel and the disciples' preparation for their ministry to the world (4:8 and 28:16). This does not of course imply an exact correspondence between the Mount of Olives scenes and others in the seven-fold scheme; Matthew was expanding a pattern, not following it mechanically.

It is striking, however, that we can trace some correspondence between the Mount of Olives references and most of the other mountain scenes. This is apparent from a review of the correspondences developed on pages 104-6 above. Item "B" indicates the interrelationship of 21:1, 24:3, and 26:30 and, in the parentheses, the relationship of one or more of these to other mountain scenes. In fact one or more of the Mount of Olives scenes shares motifs with all of Matthew's other mountain scenes except for 4:8. This is confirmed also in items "C," "D," "F," "G," and "J." No other mountain scenes have so many, and so diverse, connections with the other mountains. Thus the literary data confirm our suspicion that this group of three references, already in the synoptic tradition, provided the stimulus for Matthew, the seed which bore fruit in the scheme of seven mountains.

In the conclusion to chapter one we suggested that Matthew developed his seven-fold dramatic structure for 17:1-9 from a similar though smaller pattern in Mark 9:2-8. This bears a striking resemblance to his expansion of an initial pattern of three mountains in the passion week accounts into the scheme of seven mountains now employed in his gospel as a whole. The first is development on the micro level; the second on the macro level.

Our interest in the seven-fold mountain scheme was piqued by the setting of 17:1-9 upon a mount. It is clear that Matthew has developed a pattern of mountains, and equally clear that the transfiguration account is integrated into it. This may be emphasized once again by our referring to items "A," "D," "E," "H," and "I" on pages 104-6 above. It now remains to examine the theology of Matthew's transfiguration account, and its relationship to the theology and the structure of the gospel as a whole. To these tasks we turn in chapter three.

CHAPTER III

THE THEOLOGY OF MATTHEW'S TRANSFIGURATION ACCOUNT

The Purpose of Matthew 17:1-9

The purpose of the transfiguration narrative has eluded even those students who saw in it a picture of Jesus in relationship with his disciples. For some its focus is Jesus; its function, to explain his nature or role in the history of salvation.[1] For others its focus is the disciples; its function, to present to them the nature of Jesus, or to prepare them for the trials they must undergo as his followers.[2] We cannot solve this dilemma with respect to Mark--for that is where the investigation has been conducted heretofore--but our studies certainly encourage a broader view of Matthew's intentions.

---

[1] Arthur M. Ramsey, *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1949), p. 142; George D. Barry, *The Transfiguration of Our Lord* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1911), p. 66; Lionel P. Crawfurd, *The Transfiguration: A Manifestation of God in Man* (London: Skeffington & Son, 1912), pp. 25-26.

[2] C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 294 with extensive argumentation; R. H. Lightfoot, *Gospel Message*, p. 44, which combines the interests developed in redaction criticism towards Mark's individual treatment of the tradition with almost a modern literary-critical understanding of the effect of the text upon its readers. According to Lightfoot, the story gives for the reader, just as for the three disciples in the story, the divine approval of Jesus' teaching regarding the cross as essential to his ministry. Among earlier works see for example Bernhard Weiss, *Das Marcusevangelium und seine Synoptischen Parallelen* (Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz, 1872), p. 295.

XUM

In chapter one we saw that the structure of his account emphasizes both Jesus and the disciples; and the largest Matthean addition, 17:6-7, treats of both. This suggests that Matthew's concern is with Jesus and the disciples. His purpose is to define discipleship by presenting the relationship between the Lord and his followers. We wish now to approach 17:1-9 from this point of view, to determine whether it offers an understanding of Matthew's transfiguration account which is both consistent within 17:1-9 and consistent with the picture of discipleship in the gospel as a whole.

Matthew 17:2,5

Matthew's first important development of the tradition is his description of Jesus' face during the transfiguration experience: καὶ ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος (17:2). This marks a decisive advance over Mark 9:2-3, which described Jesus' clothes only. This has been related, correctly, to Exodus 34:29-35, where we find the themes of Moses' face shining, the fear of the followers, an encounter upon a mountain, and the "tent." It should however also be related to Matthew's other development of the narrative which involves brightness, the description of the cloud as φωτεινή in 17:5a. Davies has connected this with the shekinah, as proving that the voice from the cloud is God's witness to Jesus as the "beloved son."[1] This implies also that the "brightness" which illumines Jesus' face in 17:2

---

[1] W. D. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1964), p. 52

XUM

is the presence of God. Thus whatever the history-of-religions background of Mark's transfiguration account, Matthew clearly sets the event in an Old Testament context: the shekinah resides for a moment visibly in Jesus upon the mount of transfiguration.[1]

This is confirmed by the use of ἐπισκιάζω in 17:5. The "bright" cloud is already unusual;[2] it is paradoxical in connection with this verb, which implies darkness rather than light. The term is rare in the LXX;[3] the only close parallel deserves to quoted at length:

> καὶ ἐκάλυψεν ἡ νεφέλη τὴν σκηνὴν
> τοῦ μαρτυρίου, καὶ δόξης κυρίου ἐπλήσθη
> ἡ σκηνή· καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνάσθη Μωυσῆς
> εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν σκήνην..., ὅτι ἐπεσκίαζεν...
> ἡ νεφέλη καὶ δοξης κυριου ἐπλήσθη ἡ σκηνή.[4]

The cloud covering the tent, and the glory entering into the tabernacle, form a striking parallel to Jesus' being overshadowed and filled with the glory in 17:2,5. If this is so, then Matthew must be presenting Jesus as the tabernacle, mediating the presence of God to his disciples. It is a concrete and dramatic development of the idea expressed more generally perhaps in John 1:14.

This also suggests a new explanation of Peter's notorious error in 17:4. It is generally recognized that the background to this is the feast of tabernacles; Peter's error, then, lies in reducing Jesus to an equality with the Old Testament worthies who appear in 17:3, or in wanting to prolong a pleasant experience.[1] While Matthew is aware of the reference to Booths, he shifts the center of gravity away from this to the identification of Jesus with the tabernacle. Peter's error, then, really lies in his wanting to build the booths at all. For this shows his failure to identify Jesus as the tabernacle, a "booth" which renders all booths superfluous.

---

[1] On the whole question of the shekinah and the commission (28:19) see further p. 181f. below, where we have occasion to refer also to Barth, Tradition, p. 135, which contains a helpful discussion of the matter.

[2] The Old Testament is concerned usually with the "dark" cloud. Compare Exodus 19:16.

[3] It is used only at Exodus 40:35, Psalms 90:4, 139:7, and Proverbs 18:11.

[4] Exodus 40:34-35.

The understanding of the brightness of 17:2 as the presence of the shekinah does not, however, exhaust its meaning. Matthew is also related to another important signification of "brightness," its use in apocalyptic as a mark of those who are living in the kingdom of God.[2] Michaelis noted that Matthew 28:3 offered the closest parallel in the synoptic tradition to the appearance of Jesus in the transfiguration story. But, curiously enough, he connected it with Mark 9:3 instead of the closer material in Matthew 17:2.[1] This passage shows that 17:2 identifies Jesus as belonging to the heavenly realm; to this extent Matthew's transfiguration account is a revelation of Jesus' heavenly nature. But it is striking that Matthew's resurrection accounts do not include such physical manifestations (compare Luke 24:36-43 and John 20:19-29). This alone suggests that Matthew did not regard the transfiguration narrative as proleptic of the resurrection of Jesus.[2] It also indicates that for Matthew the risen Lord is somehow still short of the full glory revealed as essentially his in the transfiguration event; something remains to be accomplished before this can be revealed to all men.

---

[1] The problem of Peter's error has generated a considerable body of discussion. One may begin as well as anywhere with the commentaries, ad loc. One of the most charming assessments of Peter's actions is that of St. Augustine; he comments in Sermon 28 that Peter is weary of the world--"why should he depart thence again to travail and pains?"--and then exhorts him: "Come down Peter: thou wast desiring to rest on the mount. . . ." The reference is to Augustine, "Sermons on Selected Lessons of the New Testament," trans. MacMullen, ed. Philip Schaff, in A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, ed. Philip Schaff (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1888), 6: p. 347 and 348 respectively.

[2] See on this motif Psalm 104:2, Isaiah 9:1 LXX, Daniel 10:6, 12:3, Testament of Levi 18:4, IV Ezra 7:97, 7:125, I Enoch 14:20, 104:2, 108:12, II Enoch 22:8-10. Gerber, "Metamorphose," associated the transfiguration tradition on this basis with Jewish apocalyptic. It is noteworthy that the motif of brightness was also of interest to Lohmeyer in his associations of the transfiguration with Hellenistic religions. See Lohmeyer, "Verklärung."

Now it is of the greatest importance that the motif of brightness is also connected with the question of discipleship in Matthew. Two important terms in 17:2,5 appear elsewhere in Matthew only in relation to discipleship (φωτεινόν in 6:22, λάμπω in 5:15-16).[1] The related term φῶς is also important in this context: 4:16 suggests that Jesus himself is the "light" promised in Isaiah 9:1; in 5:14 the disciples are called to be the "light" of the world (compare the negative expression in 6:23); and in 10:27 the disciples are to bring to light the previously secret teaching of Jesus--which in 28:16-20 is to be extended from Israel to the entire world. But the crucial passage in connection with the transfiguration account in Matthew is 13:43: τότε οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμψουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν.[2] This appears in the context of parables about the final judgment; indeed it concludes the explanation of the parable of the weeds of the field (13:36-43). The "shining" then belongs to those disciples who "endure to the end" (24:13), who emerge justified on the other side of the judgment in 25:31-46. For Matthew the transfiguration is not only a revelation of Jesus' true, heavenly nature, but also a demonstration of what awaits those disciples who, remaining faithful to their Lord, enter "the kingdom of their Father" (13:43). That both the interpretation of the parable and the transfiguration are seen as decisive challenges to the disciples is shown in the use of the related phrases οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμψουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος (13:43) and ἔλαμψεν ... ὡς ὁ ἥλιος (17:2).

---

[1] Michaelis, *TWNT* 4: 249. It is worth noting that D lat sy^{c} bo^{pt}; Cy (Epiph) harmonized 17:2 with 28:3 by reading χιων in the earlier passage. On this Michaelis compares Isaiah 1:18, Psalm 51:7, I Enoch 106:2,10, and Sirach 43:18. See ibid., p. 247.

[2] For the decisive importance of this hoary theory in the study of the transfiguration see p. 3 above. The fullest statement of it by the man who probably originated the idea is found in Julius Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci übersetzt und erklärt* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1903), p. 77: ". . . . Man darf nach Mt 28:16 die Vermutung wagen, dass sie eigentlich ein Auferstehungsbericht war und vielleicht der Älteste in den Evangelien." The theory can be seen at work in German, Anglo-American, and French scholarship. For example, see Erich Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr-Paul Siebeck, 1950), p. 86; Frederick C. Grant, *The Earliest Gospel* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1943), pp. 155-56, with particular reference to Mark 9:1 as a key to Mark's intentions; and Albert-Marie Denis, "Une théologie de la Rédemption: La Transfiguration chez Saint Marc," *La Vie Spirituelle* 101 (1959): 145: the transfiguration is "bien une resurrection glorieuse anticipée."

---

[1] Attention may also be drawn to a possible parallel between Matthew 5:15-16 and the Rabbinic tradition that Adam was the lamp of the world. On this see Shab. 5b, 1 46., referred to in Paul Strack and Herman L. Billerback, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, 5 vols. (Munich: Beck, 1922-61), 1: ad loc.

[2] Fenton, Gospel, p. 276, mentions 13:43, but not its significance.

At this point a question emerges. Is not the term for heavenly glory δόξα, which indeed Luke uses in his transfiguration account (Luke 9:31)? Why does Matthew not use this term if his intention is to reveal Jesus' glory and that of the disciples later on? The answer is that Matthew employs δόξα always in connection with the judgment carried out by the Son of man (16:27, 19:28, 24:30, 25:31) and never with reference to Jesus' earthly life. It is a term belonging to the parousia; but the parousia is not the same thing for Matthew as the life "in the kingdom of the Father" spoken of in 13:43. The parousia and the judgment belong together (25:31-33!), and both precede the life in the kingdom--indeed, they are the precondition for the establishment of that kingdom, since only those who "pass" in the judgment may enter it. So while δόξα belongs to the parousia and judgment, Matthew describes the life in the kingdom by the related terms λάμπω (with reference to Jesus) and ἔκλαμπω (with reference to the disciples). While too much weight should not be put on grammatical subtleties, it is possible that the ἔκλαμπω of the disciples is thought of as a reflected glory, stemming from the λάμπω of Jesus himself.[1]

This indicates that Matthew did not think of his transfiguration account as proleptic of the parousia, but of the shared life in the kingdom which followed the parousia and final judgment. Thus another of the

---

[1] This is perhaps a parallel to Moses: Jesus' disciples shine by his reflected glory, as Moses' face shone by the reflected glory of God. There is also a possible connection with the Rabbinical tradition of the shining faces of the disciples of a great rabbi.

XUM

dominant interpretations of the transfiguration accounts may be laid to rest--at least with regard to Matthew's gospel.[1] It was intended there to prefigure neither the resurrection nor the parousia, but an event--or rather, a state--which followed both, and in which both Jesus and his disciples are to share.

Those who are to share this life in the kingdom are described in 13:43 as the δίκαιοι . Although the term is used in a general sense in Matthew's gospel (1:19, 5:45), and to describe the Old Testament worthies (13:17, 23:29?), its primary connection is with membership in the kingdom. This "righteousness" of the disciples is rooted in that of their Lord. His δικαιοσύνη is seen, ironically, by pagans and by contrast with the false discipleship of the followers of the Pharisees.[2] As applied to the disciples, the term δίκαιοι refers especially to those who serve their Lord. This is developed through the parallelism of 10:40-42 (where it must be remembered that the "little ones" are those who are characteristic of the kingdom, as in 19:14). The reception

---

[1] See the discussion on p. 3 above. Examples of this position--in addition to Perrin, cited in the previous discussion--include Eduard Schweitzer, The Good News According to Mark, trans. David H. Madvig (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1970), p. 181; M. Sabbe, "De Transfigurate van Jezus," Collationes Brugenses et Gandavenses 4 (1958): 488-89; Vincent Taylor, The Life and Ministry of Jesus (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1955), p. 153 (with some reservations); above all G. H. Boobyer, "St. Mark and the Transfiguration," JTS 41 (1940): 119-40 and, more completely, G. H. Boobyer, St Mark and the Transfiguration Story (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1942), p. 75 and passim. The transfiguration as proleptic of the ascension--as for example J. G. Davies, "The Prefigurement of the Ascension in the Third Gospel," JTS 6 (1955): 229-33--is not of interest to redaction-critical students of Matthew.

[2] See 27:19 (Pilate's wife), some texts of 27:24 (Pilate), with reference to pagans; some texts of 27:4 (on Judas); and for the Pharisees and their followers 23:28 and 23:35.

XUM

"in the name" demanded of the disciples implies identification with the person received: the prophet is received by a prophet, the "righteous one" by a fellow disciple; the "little ones" by those who recognize in them the marks of membership in the kingdom--marks which they themselves bear as well. And according to the programmatic statement of 10:40, receiving a disciple is tantamount to receiving the Lord himself; the disciple is so closely related to Jesus that to serve one is the same thing as serving the other. Thus 25:31-46 is merely an extension of 10:40-42 to the scene of the final judgment; the true disciple is he who has done "the will of my Father who is in heaven" (7:21).

If the disciple is δίκαιος , then his life is characterized by δικαιοσύνη, as indicated in 6:33. δικαιοσύνη is not merely a quality to be added to one's life after the "essentials" have been provided for, but the basic quality of life, without which all material things are only a witness to the lordship of mammon. It is this which distinguishes the disciples of Jesus from the Pharisees and Scribes (5:20; 6:1-4 indicates they must not exalt themselves above others, however). The specific reference of δικαιοσύνη to the life of discipleship must be preserved against the generalizing quality of many translations. Matthew 5:10 reads in the NEB "How blest are those who have suffered persecution for the cause of right"; but in reality this is a statement that the kingdom will belong to those who bear the quality of true discipleship, a δικαιοσύνη achieved in one's relationship with Jesus. It is directed specifically to the consolation of those suffering the persecutions foretold in 10:16-23 and 24:9-14, borne not for the cause of "right" but

XUM

for the name of Jesus. The same may be said for 5:6, where the subject is not those who "hunger and thirst to see right prevail" (NEB), but those who long to be accounted among those whose faces will shine in the kingdom (13:43), that is, the δίκαιοι .

Matthew's expectation of the transformation of the faithful finds a striking parallel in II Baruch 51:10:

> Also (as for) the glory of those who have now been justified in My law, who have had understanding in their life, and who have planted in their heart the root of wisdom, then their splendour shall be glorified in changes, and the form of their face shall be turned into the light of their beauty, that they may be able to acquire and receive the world which does not die, which is then promised to them. . . . for over this above all shall those who come then lament, that they rejected my law, and stopped their ears that they might not hear wisdom or receive understanding. . . . they shall respectively be transformed, the latter into the splendour of angels, and the former shall yet more waste away in wonder at the visions and in the beholding of the forms. . . . But to those who have been saved by their works, and to whom the law has been now a hope . . . shall wonders appear in their time. . . . for in the heights of the world shall they dwell, and they shall be made like unto the angels, and be made equal to the stars, and they shall be changed into every form they desire, from beauty into loveliness, and from light into the splendor of glory.[1]

Among the themes shared by this passage and Matthew's concept of discipleship are the concept of justification (δικαιοσύνη), the acquisition of an undying world by the faithful, the changing of form of the faithful, and the comparison with the angels in heaven. But above all II Baruch is dominated by the theme of the law as the key to salvation and thus to the promised glorious transformation. And it is well known that

---

[1] The quotations from II Baruch are taken from the translation in R. H. Charles' edition. See p. 110, n. 4.

XUM

the "law" is decisive for Matthew's concept of discipleship.[1] While we will develop this at some length in connection with Matthew's treatment of the prophet-traditions in 17:3, and the mission charge in 28:16-20, we can point already to Matthew's advance over the Judaism represented by II Baruch. For Matthew the "law" is not that of the Old Testament, but the words of Jesus the Lord; and the transformation is promised not merely to Israel, but to all who obey these words, even among "the nations" (28:19). Furthermore, this transformation is not just a promise, but something already revealed to the disciples upon the mount of transfiguration (17:2).

It appears, then, that Matthew has combined two themes in his alteration of the transfiguration tradition in 17:2,5. There is first Jesus as the _shekinah_-filled tabernacle, mediating God's presence to the new Israel; and, secondly, Jesus as revealing the radiance of those who live in the kingdom of their Father--a radiance now revealed as Jesus' true nature, but one also promised as the destiny of those μαθηταί who are faithful "to the end" (24:13).

Matthew 17:3

The central problem raised by 17:3 is the relation of Matthew's transfiguration account to the figure of the eschatological prophet. This is widely believed to be the tradition-historical background to the appearance

---

[1] This is a frequent theme, for example, in Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, _Tradition and Interpretation_. See first Bornkamm's discussion, pp. 40-41. Further references may be found by consulting the index.

XUM

of Moses and Elijah upon the mount of transfiguration. However, the precise relationship of the accounts to that tradition has not been determined--partly because the concept of the "prophet" itself is so fluid.[1] This was undoubtedly due to the association of the figure with two of the most significant figures of Israel's history. For it is also generally agreed that Moses and Elijah represent two main streams of traditions concerning the prophet, the one based upon Deuteronomy 18:15ff. and stressing his activity as redeemer, performer of miracles, and expounder of Torah; the other stemming from Malachai 3:1, 23 (LXX) and stressing his activity as announcer of the end of history and goad to repentance.[2] In Mark's transfiguration account, then, this division is overcome, and Jesus is presented as the eschatological figure combining both streams of the prophet tradition. And Matthew, it may be assumed, simply accepted this bequest of the transfiguration tradition.[3]

---

[1] The "prophet" has enjoyed a recent vogue of sorts. One may begin with the Appendix to Ferdinand Hahn, The Titles of Jesus in Christology, trans. Harold Knight and George Ogg (London: Lutterworth Press, 1969), pp. 352-406. See also Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, trans. Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (London: SCM Press, 1963), pp. 13-50, and the excellent articles on Moses and Elijah by Joachim Jeremias in TWNT 4: 848-73 and 2: 928-41 respectively. An essay of enduring value which emphasizes the role of the prophet figure in Christology is John A. T. Robinson, "The Most Primitive Christology of All?" in 12 New Testament Studies (London: SCM Press, 1962), pp. 139-153. Cullmann, Christology, p. 22, gives a composite picture which shows the diversity of expectation. It included the prophet as preacher, revealer of final mysteries, restorer of true revelation, inaugurator of the last age, revealing the will of God, re-establishing the tribes of Israel, overcoming the "powers," suffering with prophets of old, and even doing battle with the Anti-Christ.

[2] Hahn, Titles, pp. 354ff.

[3] Rarely do the commentators advance beyond the obvious fact that Matthew has reversed the order of their appearance compared to Mark 9:4.

A more adequate treatment of Matthew's relationship to this tradition must begin with his use of the term προφήτης. The crucial passages are those in which Jesus himself is associated with the figure. In 16:13-14 and 21:46 Matthew indicates that "the people" thought of Jesus as a prophet. That this did not indicate "the" prophet is evident from the association with both Elijah and John the Baptist, not to mention the vague comment "Jeremiah or one of the prophets" (16:14).[1] This is merely the application to Jesus of speculations also referred to John the Baptist (11:9, 14:5, 21:26). Jesus seems to apply the term to himself in 13:57, but this may be merely a generalized wisdom-saying.

Matthew refers to Jesus as ὁ προφήτης in only one instance, 21:11. This must be read in light of the triumphal entry (21:6-11), of which it forms the conclusion. In 21:9 Jesus is hailed as he who "comes in the name of the Lord."[2] The description cannot be gratuitous in light of John the Baptist's question to Jesus in 11:3: σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος; The use of ὁ ἐρχόμενος in 21:9 may then be a theological commentary upon the significance of the event. Thus the crowd's acclamation in 21:11 might be scanned οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ προφήτης, Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀπὸ

---

[1] It is interesting that Matthew is the only gospel in which Jeremiah is mentioned. Later Rabbinic sources sometimes parallel Moses and Jeremiah. For example, Rabbi Juda b. Simon (about 320) in P^{e}siq 112a lists several parallel accomplishments of the two--both had prophetic careers of 40 years, etc. And Hist Dt. 18:15 relates that passage to Jeremiah.

[2] It is just possible that this theme of "coming" is echoed in Matthew's picture of Jesus as one who continually "comes" to the disciples. The verb is used in many of the mountain scenes in Matthew.

Ναζαρὲθ τῆς Γαλιλαίας--"this is the prophet, that is, Jesus from Nazareth in Galilee." But perhaps it is pressing for too much to seek the strict term "the" prophet; the article is in fact absent even in the promise of the prophet given in Deuteronomy 18:15,18. And even if Matthew 21:11 does describe Jesus as "the" prophet, this establishes only that the crowd so designates Jesus.[1]

Matthew's passages relating Jesus to the figure of the prophet have no particular connection with his transfiguration account. In the past the connection between transfiguration and prophet has rested solely upon the appearance of Moses and Elijah in Mark 9:4. But is there any relationship between the figure of the prophet and the motif of the transformation itself?

This may be found in the change in nature or function that often accompanies the prophetic office in Jewish tradition. This change, of course, takes many forms. It ranges from the enormities attributed to Samson, and the nakedness of Saul, to the radical alteration of the lives of Isaiah and Jeremiah after their calls.[2] But let us go a step further and ask whether such a change can be related to the term which is used in the transfiguration accounts themselves, μεταμορφόω (Mark 9:2, Matthew 17:2). The term is not so used in the Old Testament; but there is an instance in Philo which forms a particularly interesting parallel. In Life of Moses 1. 57, Moses rescues several maidens from vile shepherds. The shepherds react in this manner:

---

[1] The crowd--at least during the passion week--is hardly the touchstone for a true understanding of the nature of Jesus. Soon enough the crowd is ready to call for Jesus' death (27:20).

[2] Judges 15:14ff., 15:4ff., ISamuel 10:6-13, where the spirit of the Lord, it is said, will turn Saul into "another man," I Samuel 19:18-24, Isaiah 6:1ff., and Jeremiah 1:4ff.

> ταῦτα διεξιόντος, φοβηθέντες, ἐπεὶ καὶ λέγων ἅμα, ἐνεθουσία μεταμορφούμενος εἰς προφήτην....

The motif of transfiguration is expressly related to Moses' assumption of the "prophetic" role.[1] In Life of Moses 2. 69-70 Philo describes Moses' ascent of Sinai and the transformation and amazing brilliance of his face when he returns to the people. His activity upon the mount is described as ἤρξατο προφητεύειν καὶ θεοφορεῖσθαι (69). Upon the approach of death, according to Life of Moses 2. 288, Moses' soul and body are resolved into a single entity (ὅς αὐτὸν δυάδα ὄντα ... εἰς μονάδος ... μεθαρμοζόμενος εἰς νοῦν), with the result that he begins "prophesying" to each tribe "the things which were to be and hereafter must come to pass." Again prophecy and transformation are combined. These themes are associated with divinization in *Questions and Answers on Exodus* 2. 29.[1] In light of the association of transformation and radiance with prophecy in Philo, it may well be that Matthew also intends the transformation as a hint that Jesus is seen as a prophet also in the transfiguration account. But before we define this role more closely, a further comment is in order.

---

[1] The whole scene shares many themes with the transfiguration account, including the transformation itself, the connection with the face, and the fear of the on-lookers. The amazement of the witnesses to the sight of Moses' change also appears in Life of Moses 2. 69, on Exodus 34:29-30. The affair of the maidens and shepherds is "demythologized" by Josephus, who merely recounts Moses' aid to the women (Jewish Antiquities 2. 260). The explanation of Moses' miraculous powers in Philo is also related to the theme of change. Life of Moses 1. 155-59 indicates that Moses received "perfect wealth," that is the whole world, because he appeared worthy to be "a partner of His [God's] own possessions (155). (The theme of inheritance is of course not strange to Paul!) The inheritance was the source of the miraculous powers, for then "each element obeyed him as its master, changed its natural properties and submitted to his command. . . ." (156). This is logical enough, according to Philo, because "what belongs to friends is common, and the prophet is called the friend of God," in other words, the whole discussion lies under the rubric of Moses as prophet. The translations to these and other texts of Josephus and Philo, unless otherwise indicated, are from the Loeb Classical Library.

In view of the importance of the disciples in Matthew's transfiguration account, it is striking that Philo urges Israel to pursue the "imitation of Moses" as a path to perfection. In *Life of Moses* 1. 159 he exclaims, "Happy are they who imprint, or strive to imprint, that image in their souls"; it is not clear whether he refers to the picture of the "essence of existing things" (158) which Moses has seen, or to Moses himself who was able to see the "essence." Since for Philo the goal of the contemplative life was ultimate divinization, this may imply that Israel is to strive to be "changed" just as Moses was; the "imitation of Moses" would result in their divinization as well. Now we have seen that Matthew expects the ultimate transformation of the disciples who enter the kingdom of the Father (13:43). But what for Philo is the goal of this life, gained through contemplation and obedience to the Torah, stands for Matthew on the other side of the "end of the age" and the final judgment, to be gained through loyalty to Jesus and obedience to his commands, even at the cost of suffering.[1] For whatever prophetic role Jesus is assuming in Matthew, it does include suffering among its burdens. And if the disciples are commissioned in such a role in Matthew's transfiguration account--a possibility we will discuss in connection with 17:7,9--they know already that their suffering (24:9-13) is only an extension of that meted out to the prophets of old (5:12) and to their Lord.[2]

---

[1] This reads in part "For when the prophetic mind becomes divinely inspired and filled with God. . . . he is changed into the divine, so that such men become kin to God and truly divine." According to Philo, of course, change is necessary if one is to approach the divine. Of the angels who visited Sarah it is said that they assumed human form (εἰς ἰδέαν ἀνθρώπων μεμορφῶσθαι), *Life of Abraham* 118. So Moses' contact with God on Sinai requires his "change," and Philo comments on Exodus 24:12a that "a holy soul is divinized by ascending not to the air or to the ether or to heaven (which is) higher than all but to (a region) above the heavens." Divinization is more than elevation to another, higher spiritual "level of existence." The change is qualitative, not just quantitative.

But now let us consider the prophetic role which Jesus is to assume. We noted earlier that scholars have approached Moses and Elijah (17:3) as discrete figures; the burden of the transfiguration account, then, is that Jesus surpasses and replaces both at once, combining features of both in himself. But which features? And from which traditions? Does Moses represent the prophets, and Elijah the law, or vice versa?[3] Does Jesus replace Moses and Elijah in their Old Testament guises, or in the eschatological prophet-traditions to which each gave rise? Perhaps the countless attempts made at these problems, and the many answers offered, indicate that the approach is incorrect.[1] We suspect that the difficulties arise from an impulse to fragment the evidence and to investigate the material in the narrowest and most specific way.[2] Let us begin, however, with the one incontestable fact about Matthew 17:3 itself, that Moses and Elijah appear together and are never separated in the transfiguration account. This suggests a new approach to their traditions and that of the eschatological prophet. This we will pursue through a reexamination of the classic texts for the expectation of the "prophet."

---

[1] The real parallel to Philo is perhaps Paul in II Corinthians 3:18, where the transformation is said to occur even during one's life--which may be even earlier than in Philo!

[2] In Antiquities, 8. 354, Elisha requests and receives permission to take leave of his parents before following Elijah. Perhaps this is a contrast to Matthew 8:21ff. in which the follower of Jesus cannot afford such luxuries.

[3] See the commentaries, ad loc.

The first of these is the promise of the "prophet like Moses" in Deuteronomy 18:15-22. The connection of αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε in 18:15 with the ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ of Matthew 17:5 has long been established. In fact there are many links between this passage and Matthew's transfiguration account.[3] In light of the importance of discipleship in that account it is especially interesting that the prophet is to be a προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου (18:15); the disciples are regularly referred to in Matthew as "brothers" who

---

[1] Hugo Grotius, Novum Testamentum (London: Smith, 1727), p. 68; F. J. Badcock, "The Transfiguration," JTS 22 (1920-21), pp. 322, who points out that Moses is also a prophet, and suggests the importance of the unity of the figures rather than their diversity; Josef Schmid, The Regensburg New Testament: The Gospel According to Mark, ed. A. Wikenhauser and Kuss, trans. and ed. Kevin Condon (Staten Island, New York: Alba House, 1968), p. 170, pointing out that Elijah is not a "good" identification for the representative of prophecy; Ernst Haenchen, Der Weg Jesu (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966), p. 309.

[2] Wilkens might equally have complained of a fixation upon the single stream of evidence. See p. 1, n. 1 above.

[3] The scene is connected with Sinai (Horeb also) in 18:16--that is, with the holy mountain; the fear of death aroused by the voice and the fire, referred to in 18:16, corresponds to the fear of Jesus' disciples upon experiencing the cloud and the voice in Matthew 17:5.

XUM

follow a common Lord.[1] But let us concentrate for a moment on the whole passage Deuteronomy 18:14-22. There are in fact two foci here, the prophet like Moses (18:15, 18 and contrasted with false prophets who will come according to 18:20-22), and the commands (καθότι ἂν ἐντείλωμαι αὐτῷ) brought by the prophet (18:19, and contrasted with the words of the false prophet in 18:20). In a sense the commands are the primary of the two elements; the prophet is a vehicle for their transmission to the people of Israel. The ἐντείλωμαι again points forward to Matthew 28:16-20, which echoes the universalism of the ἔθνη in Deuteronomy 18:14 and the emphasis upon the importance of all the commands (18:19) in Matthew 28:19 (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη and πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην).[2] Thus Deuteronomy 18:14-22 appears not merely to predict an "eschatological prophet," but to anticipate a figure who, in contrast to soothsayers and augurers among the nations, will bring to the people all God's commands. The passage integrates the themes of prophecy and law: the prophet is a bearer of God's law to the people.[3]

The other text to be examined is Malachi 3:22 (LXX). Here the

---

[1] Matthew 5:22-24, 7:3-5, 12:50, 18:15 (twice), 25:40, 28:10 from the post-resurrection setting. Of special interest is 23:8 in contrast with the discipleship of the Pharisees. Several of these passages are Matthean additions compared with Mark's parallel material.

[2] On Deuteronomy 18:15 in relation to the Messiah as bringer of new law, see first of all W. D. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952), pp. 10, 44, 90.

[3] The Teacher of Righteousness at Qumran apparently assumed prophetic functions (Hahn, Titles, p. 357) in addition to giving "new ordinances" for the community (ibid., p. 363); cf. 1Q pHab 2:5-10 and 7:3-5.

XUM

ἄγγελον of Malachi 3:1 is identified with Elijah. Although he is is clearly an eschatological figure, he is not described in the LXX as a "prophet." Once again we must look at the total context in Malachi 3:22-24. Elijah's role is described as reconciliation of both family and society (3:23), and, in the LXX, this is followed by the command to "remember the law of Moses my servant, just as I commanded it to him at Horeb" (3:24). Moses does not parallel Elijah here as an eschatological figure who is to come; it is not his future but his past achievement which is mentioned. The purpose of the passage is to integrate the day of the Lord (3:22) to be inaugurated by Elijah with the law brought by Moses upon Horeb. This can only mean that the law of Moses is understood to be the basis for the life of the new Israel following the day of the Lord. Thus the passage only extends an association of prophecy with the law already achieved in Deuteronomy 18:14-22. The classic passages giving rise to the "two streams" of eschatological prophet tradition actually bear witness to the unity of that tradition.[1] Together they look forward to a prophetic figure, whose function is to bear to Israel the divine law necessary for its life in a new age. This directs us yet

---

[1] On the connection of Moses and Elijah see also Josephus; for example, *Jewish Antiquities* 8. 349. The figures are also combined in Rabbinic tradition. See for example *SDr* 18:15 para 175 (107b): the people are to hear Moses "even if he tells you to transgress the law; as Elias did on Mt Carmel in offering on the forbidden place (cited in Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar* 2: 626). In the possibly later source *Midr Esther* 3:9 (97a), Elijah asks Moses for aid from heaven; Moses, being assured that there is at least one righteous man in "this generation," agrees to pray in heaven while Elijah prays on earth. The two are thus parallel savior-figures, one earthly, one heavenly. Moses and Elijah are again associated in *DtR* (201c): "God said to him: 'Moses! When I allow the prophet Elijah to come to you, you both shall come together'."

XUM

again to Matthew 28:16-20, where the disciples are sent as bearers of just such a law, the πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν of Jesus. To this we will return later on.

The eschatological prophet according to Deuteronomy and Malachi, then, is a figure combining diverse themes. We believe that the prophetic figure whom Matthew develops in his transfiguration account is just such a figure. There are traces of Matthew's interest generally in the combination of the law and the prophets rather than in their separate representatives. Thus the references to "the law and the prophets" as a shorthand for the essence of Old Testament religion (7:12, 22:40, 11:13 in connection with John the Baptist). Furthermore, there are at least two examples of Matthew's interest in their combined figures in relation to his transfiguration account. While 17:5 has long been recognized as a citation of Deuteronomy 18:15, it is not widely known that 17:11 refers to Malachi 3:23 (LXX). The use of ἀποκαταστήσει is a clear link between the two passages.[1] Thus Matthew, in the transfiguration account and its sequel, preserves a reference to both of the central eschatalogical prophet passages.

In addition there is a clear structural link between the combined figures of Moses and Elijah and Matthew's gospel. We established in chapter two a scheme of seven mountains upon which Jesus appears throughout Matthew's gospel. Let us now survey the accounts of Moses and Elijah in Exodus 19-34

---

[1] Does 17:12 indicate that, in fact, "Elijah" (=John the Baptist) has failed in the divinely-appointed mission? That a new method must now be attempted, that is somehow connected with Jesus' identity as the suffering Son of man?

XUM

and I Kings 17-II Kings 2. The following are all the descriptions of their ascending mountains:

Moses	(1)	Exodus 19:3
	(2)	Exodus 19:20
	(3)[1]	Exodus 24:9 Exodus 24:12 Exodus 24:13 Exodus 24:15 Exodus 24:18
	(4)	Exodus 34:4
Elijah	(5)	I Kings 18:19 I Kings 18:20 I Kings 18:42
	(6)	I Kings 19:8 I Kings 19:11
	(7)	II Kings 1:9

There are precisely seven separate ascents made by Moses and Elijah in the Old Testament narratives concerning their exploits. Now these ascents do not perform the same literary function as those of Jesus in Matthew's gospel; they do not provide a structure to the total ministries of the Old Testament worthies. But they do form an important general parallel to Matthew's presentation of Jesus. Moses and Elijah together performed seven ascents of mountains; Jesus, who replaces their combined figures, himself performs seven ascents.

An important theological connection may also be traced, that of the

---

[1] Again it is essential to note that several references to motion may yet be part of one and the same ascent account. Thus Exodus 24:9, as well as the next four references, all refer to one ascent of the mountain. This is true also of items (5) and (6) below.

XUM

prophet "sitting" upon the mountain. Both Moses and Elijah are described as sitting on a mountain (Exodus 24:18, the Alexandrian text: Μωυσῆς... ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος καὶ ἐκάθητο ἐκεῖ... ; II Kings 1:9 καὶ ἰδοὺ Ἠλίου ἐκάθητο ἐπὶ ... τοῦ ὄρους). "Sitting" is of course prominent in the Old Testament as a manifestation of divine power, and is found in passages with some thematic connections to Matthew's transfiguration account.[1] It is hardly any surprise to discover that Jesus himself "sits" in Matthew's gospel. It must be noted, however, that there are two strains to Matthew's use of this image. In the first Jesus as Son of man is seated upon a throne in judgment of the world (19:28, 25:31, 23:22, 26:64, and see the request of the mother Zebedee, 20:21). In the second Jesus is depicted as sitting upon a mountain during his earthly ministry, delivering ethical and apocalyptic teaching, and healing, after the Old Testament picture of God reigning from Zion in majesty (5:1, 15:29, 24:3).[2] The first strain is characterised by his glory in the future consummation; the second, by his bestowing blessings upon the people during his ministry, including teaching essential to discipleship both during that ministry and at the end. And the disciples too, if by the teaching of 24:3 they are enabled to "endure to the end," will sit upon thrones in judgment over the tribes of Israel (19:28). Thus the motif of "sitting" upon the mountain may be traced through the Old Testament conception of God, to the prophetic figures of Moses and Elijah, to Jesus, and thence to his disciples.

---

[1] See for example Isaiah 6:1, Psalm 47:8, 99:1, and note 99:7 which mentions the cloud together with the keeping of "his testimonies, and the statutes that he gave them." It is also interesting that in Psalm 99:2 Zion is identified with the home of God; and cf. 99:9, which urges Israel to "worship at his holy mountain." Psalm 80:1 affirms that God is "enthroned upon the cherubim"; and here God is called the "Shepherd of Israel." The shepherd is a major theme in Matthew's description of Jesus and the disciples--see for example 9:36, 10:6, 10:16, 18:12, 25:32, 25:33, 26:31, and for a reverse expression 7:15. Thus it is striking to see in Psalm 80 a possible parallel to Matthew's transfiguration account: the refrain in 80:3, 7, 19 is that God will "let thy face shine, that we may be saved!"

[2] We will see these three later as three of the five "mountains of discipleship."

There is, finally, another theological parallel to be drawn between the combined figures of Moses and Elijah and Matthew's development of Jesus. Both Moses and Elijah reconstituted Israel and, for both of them, mountains were important settings for their work. There is, again, a general parallel between their work in the Old Testament and Jesus as their fulfillment. It is perhaps here that the importance of the law in connection with Deuteronomy 18 and Malachi 3 (LXX) becomes most apparent. Moses and Elijah are to bear witness to the law as the basis for life in the new age. This is precisely what the disciples of Jesus are commanded to do, upon the final mountain in Matthew's gospel. Thus Jesus is identified at the transfiguration event in Matthew as the replacement, not of two single figures somehow here combined by the magic chemistry of tradition-history, but of the single Moses-Elijah figure already combined from the beginning in the traditions about the eschatalogical prophet.[1] As such Jesus is the bearer of the new law necessary for life in the new age. Upon the end of Jesus' earthly ministry, the disciples become the bearers of this new law unto the world. But this is only the extension to all men of that which, during that ministry, the disciples had been commanded to "hear" (7:29, 13:43, cf. 17:5). Matthew's understanding of Jesus as the new prophet is dominated by the concept of the prophet as bearer of law for the new age; in light of the importance of law in Matthew's gospel, and Jesus' words as the law for the new age, this is really Matthew's contribution to the prophet traditions. And it is another strong link between 17:1-9 and Matthew's total picture of discipleship.

---

[1] Of course we cannot deny that comparisons can be made between this or that specific feature of Jesus' ministry and of the careers of Moses and Elijah. For example, according to Strack-Billerback, Kommentar 4: 769ff., Elijah's tasks in the future will include helping the pious, aiding anyone in need, healing sickness, making the poor "rich," debating with teachers and others--all of which can be paralleled in Matthew's accounts of Jesus' ministry. Pirque Maschiach (Beth h-Midr 3. 72. 1) mentions "seven wonders" done by Elijah in the presence of the Messiah, some of which parallel aspects of Jesus' ministry. But Matthew is also presenting Jesus in a prophetic role as the bearer of the new law necessary for life in the new age, a function performed by the combined prophetic figures of Moses and Elijah.

Matthew 17:4

Matthew's next major alteration is the use of κύριε in 17:4 for the term ῥαββί in Mark 9:5. It is well known that in Matthew Judas is the only disciple to address Jesus as ῥαββί (26:25, 26:49). It is worth noting that Matthew has reinforced the point by adding the term ῥαββί at 26:25 (cf. Mark 14:21, Luke 22:22). Furthermore, both uses link Judas to the discussion carried on in Matthew 23:1-12, where the true discipleship demanded by Jesus is contrasted with the false discipleship engendered by the scribes and Pharisees. Judas' use of ῥαββί reveals that he belongs to the spiritual world inhabited by the Pharisees; he thinks of Jesus in these terms (23:7), and his own discipleship is thus merely a parody of the service which Jesus requires.

Matthew's understanding of Jesus as κύριος is well summarized

XUM

by Bornkamm.[1] Still it is not sufficient merely to describe κύριος , as he does, as a reflection of the "divine name of majesty" from Psalm 110:1. For an important set of κύριος-passages deals specifically with the subject of lordship in relationship to discipleship. In the first place stands Jesus' direct address to God as κύριος . This occurs in the famous "thunderbolt from the Johannine sky" (11:25-30), which defines Jesus' relationship with the Father. As the Father is κύριος to Jesus, so Jesus is κύριος to his disciples; and to this is added, and only in Matthew, the invitation to discipleship (11:28-30). For Matthew Jesus does not think of his own lordship apart from the discipleship of his followers. And their use of the term κύριος is very far from a static, formal attitude of worship; it does not even guarantee a true understanding of Jesus' nature and one's relationship to him. Thus the use of κύριος is often the occasion for a correction of the disciples, or at least the revelation that their discipleship is inadequate.[2] They illustrate in themselves the statement of 7:21: "Not every one who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven."

The use of κύριε in 17:4 is entirely consistent with this observation; the impact of the cloud, the voice, and the disappearance of the heavenly visitors is clearly to show how mistaken was Peter's proposal regarding the tents. Thus the omission of Mark 9:6 by Matthew by no means gets Peter "off the hook," since the disciples' use of κύριος often serves only to expose their own inadequacy.[1] The appearance of κύριε in 17:4 is not merely the "typically Matthean" address for Jesus but a signal that, in this narrative, the concept of Jesus held by the disciples is to be tested and corrected.

---

[1] In Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, Tradition and Interpretation, pp. 41ff. The passages he discusses or mentions include 8:25, 24:30, 16:22, 27:4, 18:21, 26:22 (the term used by the disciples), and 8:2, 8:6-8, 9:28, 15:22, 15:25,27 (the term used by others); and 25:11, 25:20, and 22:24 (the term used in parables).

[2] See for example 8:21ff., 8:25ff., 14:28-31, 16:22, and 18:21.

Matthew 17:5

Of the major alterations in 17:5 we have yet to examine Matthew's addition of ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα to the voice. This is obviously related to the voice at the baptism in all the synoptic gospels (3:17 and parallels). But in fact there are three locations in Matthew in which the three themes present in the voice at the transfiguration event--ὁ ἀγαπητός, εὐδόκησα, and the motif of hearing--are united. These are 3:17, 17:5 and 12:18. The last is a quotation of Isaiah 42:1-4, divided into two stanzas, 12:18 (Isaiah 42:1) and 12:19-21 (Isaiah 42:2-4). Each stanza ends with a mention of the ἔθνη. Thus the addition of εὐδόκησα in 17:5 links the Lord affirmed in Matthew's transfiguration account with the "servant" who brings justice to the ἔθνη (cf. 25:31-46, particularly 25:32), and in whose "name" they are to hope (cf. the ὄνομα in 28:19). The universalism is reinforced by the use of ἀγαπητός in 17:5 as well. The word, which is exceedingly rare in the LXX, does appear three times in Genesis 22:1-18, with the third and climactic use followed in 22:18 by the promise that "all nations" shall bless themselves through Abraham's descendants, because Abraham has "obeyed my voice."[1]

---

[1] The view that Matthew "softens" the picture of Peter and the disciples generally should be questioned in any case. He does not remove 16:21-23 (despite 16:17-19), nor 26:33-35. On this see Barth's comments in Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, Tradition and Interpretation, pp. 118-121.

It is well known that the "hearing" commanded in 17:5 is an essential mark of discipleship in Matthew, whether as challenge by Jesus to the crowd (15:10) or the disciples (13:43), or as an example of the reconciling community the disciples are to establish among themselves (18:15). This may be related also to Isaiah 42:1-4 and Genesis 22:15-18. The non-hearing in Matthew 12:19 is contrasted with the "hearing" required of the disciples: they are to perform unto Jesus the obedience denied the "servant" (42:1) in the world at large.[2] And, as for Abraham the "hearing" was the condition for his becoming the father of many nations, so for the disciples their "hearing" is the condition for their becoming the means of salvation for "all nations" (28:19).

Matthew 17:6-7, 9

With 17:6-7 we reach the heart of Matthew's transfiguration account. Chapter one has already established a three-fold integration of the passage: of vv. 6 and 7 with each other through their structural arrangement; of vv. 6-7 to v. 5 through the repetition of ἀκούω in v. 6; and of vv. 6-7 with the entire account through the alternating focus upon Jesus and his disciples. Matthew's account has to this point treated the lordship of Jesus and the discipleship of his followers; now the two sides are brought together in a paradigm of the relationship between the κύριος and his μαθηταί.

---

[1] Other uses in the Old Testament of ἀγαπητός include Isaiah 5:1, which refers to the vineyard, Israel, as the ἀγαπητός. Perhaps it is Jesus' law which is the solution to the wrong conduct of the "vineyard" in the past. Psalm 84:1 refers to the temple as ἀγαπητός; we will see later that Jesus may be intended as a substitute for the temple upon Zion. There is certainly a field here ripe for motif-study.

[2] Admittedly the non-hearing of the people in Isaiah 42:2 is a function of the Servant's self-effacement. Thus the ἀκούω of Matthew 12:18 may not bear the same connotation of "obedience" as in 3:17 and 17:5.

The disciples fall upon their faces before Jesus (17:6). This is by no means necessarily the "true worship" which now--having experienced the transfiguration--they are at last able to offer Jesus. This "worship" of Jesus is not necessarily any more correct or insightful than Peter's use of the term κύριε. Worship is offered Jesus by the magi (2:2), but also by Herod (2:8) and the mother of the sons of Zebedee (20:20). It is actually more difficult for the disciples to offer true worship to Jesus than for those whom he simply heals. For them it is merely a question of acknowledging Jesus' power over the power of Satan within them (8:2, 9:18, 15:25). But the true worship demanded of the disciples requires that they "hear" him (17:5, cf. 13:43), that they obey his law and acknowledge his lordship in its deepest dimensions.

Their failure to do this is evident in the fear which accompanies their prostration. Unfortunately this is a common element in revelation-accounts;[1] the fascination with the "form" presumably controlling the transfiguration narratives has prevented an appreciation of Matthew's own intentions. Perhaps the greatest advance has been to recognize the shifting location of the motif within the account. In Mark's version the fear follows the transformation of Jesus and the appearance of the heavenly figures; it is the usual reaction to a supernatural event, offered as an

---

[1] Among many others see Exodus 34:30, Genesis 15:1ff., Exodus 20:18, Jeremiah 1:8, Daniel 10:12, 19, Luke 24:37, Acts 10:4, Revelation 1:17.

XUM

excuse for Peter's clumsy comment (9:5-6). Now in Luke the fear is associated with the cloud (9:34) and is also the reaction to the supernatural appearance. But for Matthew the fear belongs with the command to obedience which issues from the cloud. It is not fear before the supernatural as such, but before the demand for obedience to the Lord with which the voice concludes in 17:5. It is "fear" not just before the Lord, but before the demands placed upon the disciples by his call to discipleship. And this is affirmed by the intensifying word σφόδρα, a Matthean term connected particularly with the reaction of the disciples to an important revelation in Jesus' ministry.[1]

That fear on the disciples' part reveals an inadequate worship of Jesus is clearly shown in 14:22-33. The narrative is divided into two parts, the first ending in 14:26-7 with the disciples crying out in fear, and the magisterial statement of Jesus "It is I; have no fear"; the second ending in 14:33 with the disciples confessing Jesus as the Son of God and worshipping without fear. This is entirely consistent with 11:25-30, in which Jesus identifies himself as the "Son" but then offers an invitation to discipleship couched in terms of his meekness and the "gentleness" of his "yoke." For Matthew, "fear" belongs to the worldly structures of authority inhabited for example by the Pharisees and their disciples (23:1-12). But with Jesus and his disciples it is to be different: as I John 4:18 says in another context, "perfect love

---

[1] It is used seven times in Matthew as against four in the rest of the New Testament. In 2:19 it characterizes the reaction of the magi to Jesus, in 27:54 that of the centurion to Jesus, and in 18:31 the reaction of the disciples to the story of the unjust steward. All the other uses in Matthew show the disciples' response to Jesus: 17:23 (passion prediction), 19:25 (fate of the rich), 26:22 (betrayal of Jesus).

XUM

casts out fear."

It is precisely the command of Jesus in 17:7 that the disciples "rise and have no fear." Thus 17:7 appears as the correction to 17:6. The disciples have expressed their concept of discipleship; Jesus now corrects it, thus pointing the way to the conclusion of the gospel in 28:16-20. For here, alone among the resurrection appearances of Jesus, is there no mention whatever of "fear" on the part of the witnesses, that is, the disciples who are to undertake the mission. Their readiness for that mission is revealed through the purity of their "worship" (28:17).

Jesus' approach to the disciples (προσέρχομαι) in 17:7 is familiar in contexts of worship in Matthew (8:2, 9:18, 28:9, 28:18) and in contexts of discipleship (5:1, 24:3, 26:40), where it regularly indicates his initiative in choosing his own. The command to "rise" (ἐγέρθητε) in 17:7, while it features in many revelation-scenes,[1] may also remind us of the three passion predictions 16:21-23, 17:22-23, and 20:17-19, where Matthew uses the term instead of Mark's ἀνίστημι .[2] There may be a hint of Jesus' "raising" his disciples, as he will himself be raised up by the Father.

We come now to Matthew's use of ἅπτω in 17:7. This has never

---

[1] For example, Daniel 8:18, 10:10, cf. 10:18, and also Acts 10:26, 9:6, 22:10, 26:16, cf. Revelation 4:1.

[2] See the discussion of this in chapter one (page 29 above). As we saw there, this is Matthew's only usage of the aorist passive imperative. Perhaps this lends further weight to our impression that it is Jesus' initiative which is revealed here above all.

XUM

received a satisfactory treatment.[1] W. D. Davies has made the interesting but very tentative suggestion that "Matthew 17:7, considered in the context of the Shekinah, and the proposed 'tents,' may have undertones of a kind of 'ordination'."[2] Now Davies himself recognizes that this cannot be established with certainty from Old Testament usage. That of the New Testament is not more helpful. The term is used in the active for the kindling of a flame and, more commonly, in other voices as part of the vocabulary of healing.[3] The epistles reflect a moral use: to "touch" evil is to traffic with it.[4] Mark 10:13 (= Luke 18:15) describes Jesus "touching" the children; but Matthew 19:13-15 employs a different verb. The only passage of any real similarity to 17:7 is John 20:17, but here the risen Jesus commands Mary not to touch him.[1]

---

[1] An example of the homiletical approach to this point is found in Alexander B. Bruce, The Expositor's Greek Testament (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1897), 1: 230: "a touch and a word, human and kindly, from Jesus, restore strength and composure. . . ." For more serious consideration of the motif see J. P. Lange, Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Gospel of St Matthew, trans. Edersheim and Pope, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1863), 2: 140, citing Isaiah 6:5-7; Trench, Studies, p. 216 with a good list of possible comparative passages from the Old Testament; Lohmeyer, Evangelium, p. 268. The term does not appear in TWNT; one of the few articles devoted to the subject is Otto W. Heick, "The Use of the verb HAPTO in the New Testament," Lutheran Church Quarterly 12 (1939): 90-95. This concentrates on John 20:17 and is rather disappointing.

[2] Davies, Setting, p. 55; see the entire discussion--which is so tentative that it is enclosed as one colossal parenthesis!--on pp. 54-55. This is not only interesting but has marked out an area for future advance.

[3] The use in connection with kindling is Lucan: Luke 8:16, 11:33, 15:8, Acts 28:2. On healing usages see Matthew 8:3 (= Mark 1:41 and Luke 5:13), Matthew 9:20 (= Mark 5:27 and Luke 8:44), Matthew 14:36 (= Mark 6:56), Mark 3:10 (= Luke 6:19), Luke 7:14, and Luke 7:39.

[4] See II Corinthians 6:17, Colossians 2:21, perhaps I John 5:18, and, with apologies to Paul, I Corinthians 7:1. This is similar to the main use in Old Testament law, for example Leviticus 15:12, 7:9 (cf. 19), Numbers 19:22.

Furthermore, the scenes of ordination in the New Testament do not use ἅπτω, but a form of the expression ἐπιθέντες τάς χεῖρας.[2] Matthew's scenes which show Jesus recognizing Peter in a special way do not involve physical contact at all (16:19, 18:18), nor do Jesus' mission charges to his disciples (9:37, 10:16, 28:19). A survey of extra-Biblical literature fails to yield, so far as I can determine, any exact parallels to Matthew 17:7 in this regard.[3]

---

[1] The real link of John 20:17 may be with Matthew 28:9-10, if Jesus' command in John 20:17 implies that Mary is touching him. On this problem see Raymond E. Brown, The Gospel According to John, 2 vols. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1966-70), 2: 992-94 and 1011-17, and of course Bultmann, John, pp. 686-89.

[2] Acts 13:3, 6:6, 8:18-19, 19:6, I Timothy 4:14, II Timothy 1:6. Old Testament usage is similar, for example, Numbers 27:18,23, 8:10, Deuteronomy 34:9. ἐπιτίθημι has also broader meanings in the Old Testament; cf. Exodus 29:10, with regard to the sacrificial victim.

[3] Of particular interest are the following: Philo, Allegorical Interpretation 1. 38, and On the Posterity and Exile of Cain 20. Both are concerned with contact between man and God across the gulf which separates them. For Philo this can only be bridged by divine initiative. ἅπτω does not seem to be used in the sense of Matthew 17:7 in Old Testament apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, even in the revelation-scenes in I Enoch and IV Ezra. It is worth noting, by the way, that ἅπτω does not appear to be referred to "touching" by the prophetic spirit in the Old Testament. See on this Judges 3:10, 11:29, I Kings 16:4, 16:3, 19:19, and, in addition, Philo, Life of Moses 2. 288ff.

Qumran materials are confined to one semantic field, the use of the equivalent נגע as a "blow" delivered by God for punishment of the wicked. For example, see pHab 9:11, 1QS 3:14, 4:12, 1QHab 1:18, 1:32-33, 2:7, 4:36, 5:28, 10:19, CD 13:5. As far as the papyri, see first of all James H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1960), ad loc. Citations here include examples both of the active, "to kindle," and the more common middle use in connection with healing terminology. For examples see Syll. 803. 62 from the Asclepium, Epidaurus, and also

Davies depends upon a generalized picture of the "ordination"-scene in the Old Testament.[1] Nevertheless he wonders whether ἅπτω can "bear the weight that we have put upon it."[2] Perhaps the difficulty arises in first defining the scene as an ordination--thus requiring that ἅπτω bear the meaning "putting on of hands"--rather than examining relevant Old Testament usages of ἅπτω to see what meaning it might have in connection with Matthew 17:7. There are, in fact, two contexts in which ἅπτω is found with the sense of a divine appointment to a task. In view of the problems associated with the term "ordination" it would be preferable to refer to them as "commissioning"-scenes.

The first of these contexts is the commissioning of prophets. In Isaiah 6:1-8 the prophet's mouth is "touched" in order to purify him for

---

804. 23. To these we may add Ditt. Syll.^{3} 1169. 62 and 1170. 23.

Patristic Greek shows a range of usage among the fathers but no real parallel to Matthew 17:7. A survey of G. W. H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Clarendon Press, 1961), ad loc., indicates that the use in connection with healing fades away, as does the moral sense of avoiding evil. One category does give various exegeses of John 20:17 as an example of the separation of bodily and spiritual worlds. In general "touch" is taken to mean "to effect," "to influence," or "to attain to," "to partake of," or "to be concerned about." The entry offers no parallels to Matthew 17:7.

Hellenistic literature retains the signification of healing technique as in Philostratus, Life of Apollonius of Tyana 3. 39 and 4. 45 (this last a raising from the dead). Antonius Liberalis 4. 7 has Ἀπόλλων ἁψάμενος αὐτοῦ τῇ χειρὶ πέτρον ἐποίησεν --called by Bauer "conveying a blessing." Certainly a mixed blessing! See for Greek usage Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. and ed. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Bauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), ad. loc.

Latin literature continues the variety of usage; healings are prominent. Ovid Metamorphoses 15 includes the motif of fear but not touch.

[1] For example, Deuteronomy 31:1-8, 14ff., 23, 34:9, Numbers 27:15, and possibly 11:16. Sermon, p. 54.

[2] Ibid., p. 55.

his task.[1] The motif of fear and then divine reassurance is present here, as in Matthew 17:6-7. And in Jeremiah 1:4-10, the prophet's mouth is "touched" as the prelude to his being appointed a prophet "over nations and kingdoms." Touching thus implies prophetic commissioning for a divinely-appointed task.

The second context is that of apocalyptic. In Daniel 10:4ff. the motif of "touching" appears several times (10:10, 16, 18), and it is prominent in Daniel 8:15ff. as well. These passages share with Matthew 17:1-9 the themes of prostration at the sound of a voice, fear, "touching," and being raised up. Here ἅπτω is associated with a "gift of understanding" which commissions the recipient as an interpreter of the visions given him. In both prophecy and apocalyptic the "touch" empowers and enables the recipient to witness to God's message for Israel.

Further light may be shed on this by another Matthean term which has not received nearly the attention it deserves. In 17:9 the transfiguration scene itself is described as an ὅραμα. This is well-attested as a description of visions, including dreams.[2] But in addition it is found in the Old Testament in both prophetic and apocalyptic contexts relevant to our discussion. In Moses' call or commissioning in Exodus 3:1-6, the vision of the burning bush is described as an ὅραμα. Since the image clearly includes the motif of brightness it is perhaps not too much to claim some connection with the transfiguration experience in Matthew. If ἅπτω indicates a commissioning of the disciples, then this follows upon their having seen a vision of shining brightness. Exodus 3:6 makes it plain that this brightness was the very presence of God; and we have seen reason to believe that Matthew considers this to have been present in Jesus' shining face in 17:2.

---

[1] Davies mentions this passage (ibid., no. 2): "In the 'call' of Isaiah ἅπτω (middle) is used of Isaiah's lips being 'touched' to translate נגע." But this is merely a sidelight to Davies' comment that the main use is for healing and blessing; he does not link it to the motif of ordination specifically.

[2] See Jeremiah 39:21, Revelation 4:3, 9:17 (ὅρασις); see also Corpus Hermeticum 3. 2. 3, Wilcken Ptol. 78. 37, Ditt. Syll.^{3} 1128. 3, Goodspeed 3. 5, POxy 1224 Fr. 2, recto ii. 3. The latter is interesting since Grenfell and Hunt thought that ὕπνος was the subject of με βαρησειν. The passage would then be uniting two terms found in the transfiguration accounts in the synoptics, ὅραμα (Matthew's version) and βαρεω (Luke's). For the uses of οραμα in the early church one may begin with Justin, Dialogue 78. 3, on revelations delivered through an ὅραμα to the prophets, and Hippolytus, Daniel 4. 1. 2.

Moses' commission is extended in Numbers 12:1-8, a discussion of the nature of the "true prophet" which shares several themes with the transfiguration account in Matthew.[1] The prophet, according to Numbers 12:6, is distinguished by the fact that he sees God's will in an ὅραμα, while Moses is distinguished by the fact that he sees God himself face to face. Since according to Exodus 34:31-35 this resulted in Moses' face "shining," Matthew may be suggesting another comparison with the transfiguration scene. The disciples are identified as bearers of God's message through their seeing the ὅραμα of the transfiguration; Jesus' superiority over them is shown--in line with Numbers 12:1-8 and Exodus 34:31-35--through the "shining" face of Jesus in Matthew 17:2.

These prophetic passages are balanced by several in apocalyptic.

---

[1] Including the appearance of the cloud, the mention of the tent, and the command to the people to "hear."

XUM

While this too is familiar with ὅραμα as a general term for visions,[1] the decisive passage in our context is Daniel 7:7, 13. The scene is described as an ὅραμα; its content is the appearance of the Son of man. It cannot be fortuitous that Matthew's identification of Jesus as the Son of man (17:9-13), occurs precisely in the context of the description of his transfiguration account as an ὅραμα (17:9). Jesus' disciples, too, have seen the Son of man in an ὅραμα, the ὅραμα of Matthew's transfiguration account.[2]

The background, then, of both ἅπτω and ὅραμα is scenes of commissioning or empowerment from prophecy and apocalyptic. It is important to understand this as a general, rather than a specific, kind of parallelism. When so many Old Testament scenes reveal several thematic connections with Matthew's transfiguration account, it would be foolish to concentrate upon one to the exclusion of others. And there is no reason why Matthew may not be intending to allude to several complexes of themes at once. The best approach is to see in Matthew's uses of ἅπτω and ὅραμα yet another definition of the disciples' status. They are men commissioned, and thus empowered, to bear witness to a new revelation from God. Perhaps Jesus is not the only one to be changed upon the mount of transfiguration.

But when is this commission to be carried out? According to 17:9 the ὅραμα is not to be revealed "until the Son of man is raised from

---

[1] See among many others Daniel 1:7, 2:7, 2:26, 8:1-2, 8:13, 8:15.

[2] The connection with Daniel 7 is discussed again on pp. 169-70.

XUM

the dead." The reality of Jesus as the Son of man, that is, cannot be understood apart from or before the resurrection. Thus the commissioning in 17:7 looks forward to a time after the resurrection--obviously to the mission commanded in 28:16-20.[1] We may also characterize the location of the mission. According to Daniel 7:14 the Son of man is to have authority over "all peoples, nations, and languages." This universalism is consistent with the Old Testament usage of Matthew's term ὅραμα. Genesis 15:1, which is described as an ὅραμα, recounts God's promise to Abram that he will be "father of many nations." And Matthew's other term ἅπτω is also important here. Jeremiah 1:9 finds Jeremiah established as a prophet "over nations and kingdoms" (1:10), and the action so establishing him is described by ἅπτω. We saw above that the description of Jesus as ἀγαπητός in 17:5 echoed the description of the Servant in Isaiah 42:1 as one who would bring justice to "the nations," and of Abraham in Genesis 22:15-18 as father of nations. Thus the disciples in 17:7 are commissioned in the service of a universal Lord. And the picture of the disciples as bearers of a world-wide mission--quite apart from the fact that Matthew describes for them only one other mission, that limited to Israel in Matthew 10--points inexorably to Matthew 28:16-20 *as the inauguration* of the task for which they are commissioned in 17:7. Thus 28:16-20 is not the "missionary commission"

---

[1] Perhaps this is also related to the problem of the misunderstanding of the disciples (see the discussion on pages 142-44, and 146, above). Besides the fact that Matthew has his theological reasons for showing the ignorance of the disciples, it is true that he pictures Jesus' world-wide mission as beginning only after the death and resurrection. The disciples' delay must be explained theologically (the proper time had not yet come), but it must be psychologically sensible as well--the disciples were simply unready before the resurrection. For the mission is compulsive in itself; if it has not begun it must be because its "time" has not come. Once begun it *is* the life of the church.

XUM

of the disciples, but the initiation of the work for which they have already been commissioned in 17:7, but have been enjoined from beginning "until the Son of man is raised from the dead" (17:9).[1]

Matthew 17:9-13

The sequel to Matthew's transfiguration account emphasizes the theme of suffering.[2] The specific problem discussed in 17:9-13 is the recognition of John the Baptist as Elijah. The "world" failed to achieve this recognition. ἐπιγινώσκω, a regular feature of Matthew's picture of discipleship,[3] is the goal of Jesus' teaching to the disciples in 17:9-13. When the recognition does occur it is described by the verb συνίημι, also characteristic in connection with discipleship in Matthew's gospel.[4] It occurs, and only in Matthew's account, after Jesus' comment that the Son of man is "about to suffer" (17:12b).[5]

---

[1] It is remarkable that ὅραμα appears in Acts--in addition to more conventional uses--in connection with the world-wide mission of the young church. See Acts 9:10, 9:15, 10:3, 10:17, 19, 11:5, 16:9-10, and 18:9. Each is a critical point in the expansion of the early church; at each point God speaks through an ὅραμα to thrust the church further and further into the "world"--despite the instincts of Peter and Paul.

[2] On the relationship of this unit to 17:1-9 see pp. 33-34 above.

[3] See 7:16-20 on the correspondence between one's deeds and one's nature; 14:35; and especially 11:25-30 on the intimate knowledge shared by the Father and Son, and those disciples who participate in their relationship.

[4] It separates the disciples from the Pharisees (15:12); and negatively in 16:9. This means that the explanation of the parables in 13:10ff. has failed; Jesus' acceptance of the disciples despite themselves might almost be called Matthew's version of "justification by faith alone."

[5] The use of μέλλω relates this also to the second and third passion predictions (17:22 and 20:17)--both of which uses are added to Mark (cf. Mark 9:31 and 10:32). Elijah is also described in Matthew 11:14 (but not in the parallel Luke 16:16) as being "about to come."

XUM

It is precisely this comment that enables the disciples to draw the parallel between Jesus' death and that of John the Baptist, and thus to see that, as the forerunner to Jesus, he is to be identified with Elijah.

The suffering which is the key to the disciples' understanding both Jesus and John the Baptist is also essential to their self-understanding.[1] For they are a community of the δίκαιοι (13:43). This new relationship transcends and even abolishes the traditional ties of family.[2] It separates those "inside" as bearers of the secrets of the kingdom from those who are "outside" and excluded.[3] The response of the world to this community is, inevitably, persecution, a persecution which corresponds to that suffered by the Lord. Thus the disciples' fate in 16:24 parallels that of Jesus in 16:21, a parallel Matthew has emphasized by the addition of the specific term μαθητής to 16:21 (cf. Mark 8:31). And to the suffering of Jesus as the Son of man in 17:12 corresponds the disciples' sufferings in bearing witness to Jesus as Son of man. For the disciples' persecution is closely related to their mission to "all nations" (28:19 and

---

[1] It is just possible that the use of ὀφθαλμός, rather than the general περιβλέπω in Mark 9:8, recalls the use of the ὀφθαλμός in Mark 5:29 as symbolic of the renunciation required for membership in the kingdom. See also 18:9. The ὀφθαλμός appears also in connection with those who do not recognize Jesus (13:15-16, those outside the kingdom--from Isaiah 6:10, and 26:43, the disciples in Gesthemane).

[2] See 12:49, where Matthew has replaced Mark's τοὺς περὶ αὐτόν (3:34) with τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ and also 8:21-23.

[3] See 13:10-17, where Matthew's repetition of ὀφθαλμοί in 13:16 (on this cf. Luke 10:23) emphasizes the exclusiveness, and 13:36ff., where Matthew's explanation of the parable of the weeds ends with the description of the awful fate in store for those "outside."

24:9-13). The latter can only refer to their fate during the mission upon which they are to be sent in 28:16-20. Thus the Lord's suffering described in 17:9-13, and the unity of the disciples with their Lord in suffering, point forward to the task for which they have been commissioned in 17:7,9-- and upon which they are to be sent by the risen Lord in 28:16-20.

Summary

The categories of lordship and discipleship yield a rich picture of Matthew's intentions in his transfiguration account. His lordship means bringing the presence of God to the disciples, the new Israel; at the same time he offers them a foretaste of their own life in the kingdom. The condition for inheritance of this life is obedience to the words of the Lord, and faithfulness to him. But this could not be further from a purely private matter; for the disciples are commissioned in the transfiguration account as prophetic bearers of Jesus' words, a commission to be inaugurated after Jesus' death and resurrection. Such an understanding not only forms a consistent whole from 17:1-9, but is, as we have seen, consistent with the theology of discipleship in Matthew's gospel as a whole.

Discipleship and Structure in Matthew's Gospel

The final step to be taken in our investigation is that of structural integration. We saw in chapter two that Matthew integrated his transfiguration account into the gospel as a whole through its inclusion in a pattern of seven mountains. We must now ask whether our theological understanding of the account is unified structurally with the gospel as a whole. Is there a structural pattern linking 17:1-9 *as a presentation of discipleship* with other treatments of Jesus and his disciples in Matthew?

Such a pattern does exist, and precisely among the seven-fold mountains. In 4:8-10 Matthew treats of Jesus and Satan; in 14:23 Jesus is alone upon the mount for prayer. This leaves five mountain scenes, and in each of them Jesus appears upon the mount with his disciples:

(1)	5:1-8:1	Sermon on the Mount
(2)	15:29-39	Healing, feeding of crowd
(3)	17:1-9	Transfiguration
(4)	21:1-6, 24:3-25:46, 26:30-56	Mount of Olives
(5)	28:16-20	Inauguration of mission

There are thus five "mountains of discipleship," mountains upon which Jesus relates to his disciples, and of which the transfiguration is the central element.[1] We will now survey each of these scenes, paying, in light of earlier discussion, particular attention to 28:16-20, and then we will attempt to define their overall significance.

Matthew 5:1-8:1

Matthew 5:1 is the first use of the term μαθητής in Matthew's gospel. The importance of this first of the five discourses for his view of discipleship is suggested by a contextual analysis. Thus in 4:12-17 Matthew records the beginning of Jesus' ministry, followed immediately by

---

[1] We need hardly mention again the importance of the five-fold pattern for Matthew's gospel. See the brief discussion on p. 97 above.

XUM

the summoning of the first followers (4:18-22), and a programmatic statement of Jesus' work as teaching, preaching, and healing (4:23-25).[1] This is itself followed by the first concrete instance of Jesus' teaching, the Sermon on the Mount (ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς λέγων, 5:2). Thus the beginning of Jesus' teaching ministry is concerned with the life of discipleship. In view of the discussion on pages 139-41 above it is interesting to note that Jesus "sits" to deliver the teaching.

There is some confusion about the audience for the sermon.[2] We cannot imagine that the μαθηταί of 5:1 are limited to the four who have been called in 4:18-22 (but we have been told of no others). Furthermore, although 5:1 implies that Jesus ascended the mount to escape the crowds, and thus the sermon is to be private teaching for the disciples, 7:28 clearly indicates that the crowds heard the teaching as well. There is, then, no distinction between the μαθηταί and the ὄχλος as hearers of the teaching. It is not private in its delivery, but rather in its reception; its meaning is apparent only to those who can "hear" (7:24-27). It is not presented in debate or discussion (cf. 19:1-23), but is open-ended, almost in lecture style, and presents the characteristics of the life of discipleship to all who "listen."

From the ἔθνικος of 5:47 and 6:7 it appears that the teaching is directed to Israel, in conformity with the first stages of Jesus' mission in Matthew's gospel (10:5-6).[1] But Jesus already appears as the fulfillment of Israel's hopes; his teaching sums up "the law and the prophets" (7:12). In addition, the relationship with Jesus is already defined as the key to the life of discipleship (7:13ff., 7:21-23, 7:24-27, and cf. 12:50). The reaction of the disciples (and of the crowds in 7:28) is not defined as worship.

---

[1] This programmatic phrase appears again in 9:35. It is very interesting that the disciples take on the functions of preaching and healing during Jesus' ministry, but the teaching comes later. See below in connection with 28:16-20.

[2] See the discussion above, pp. 65-67.

The sermon concludes with the mention of Jesus' ἐξουσία as that which distinguishes his teaching from the Scribes' (7:29). This is exemplified in 5:17-48; the contrast is developed in the antitheses "the sayings of old" and Jesus' "But I say to you. . . ." Thus the fulfilling of the law and the prophets consists in extending their teaching from external behavior to one's inmost motivations.[2] Jesus' superiority over the Scribes lies in the fact that whereas they merely reinterpret--but do not extend--the scriptures, Jesus arrogates to himself the "authority" to add something new, which reestablishes the original intent of the scriptures (cf. 15:3-9). The Scribes have made of the law and the prophets a dead letter; Jesus raises them to new life. We will see later that this function is extended to his disciples as well.[3]

---

[1] "Israel" is not the same thing as Palestine. That the mission relevant to Matthew's own church--that to diaspora Judaism--may be in mind here is hinted by the appearance of Gentile figures in 10:18. We see from the history of Paul in Acts that a mission to diaspora Judaism could certainly lead one to examination by Gentile magistrates. Of course this is inconsistent theologically with the scheme: Matthew 10--Israel; Matthew 24--the world, as commanded in 28:16-20.

[2] We blush to mention this chestnut of the old liberal interpretation. In this case, it happens to be correct.

[3] Does Matthew remove the theme of "calling the twelve" from 10:1-5 (cf. Mark 3:13-19) because he understands the Sermon on the Mount as the "call"? At any rate there is no "call" as such in Matthew.

XUM

Matthew 15:29-39

Matthew himself has located these events upon the mountain (cf. Mark 8:1-10). Once again Jesus "sits" to receive both the crowd and the disciples. But the picture of the disciples has developed in two respects beyond that of 5:1-8:1. They are here clearly distinguished from the crowd, as they are not in the Sermon on the Mount. This is shown by their separate appearance in 15:32, as those with a special relationship with Jesus. And now this relationship is defined by their activity. They are no longer merely hearers of the word, but doers as well (cf. 7:21). In their distribution of the food to the crowd (15:36) they are participants in Jesus' ministry, mediating his blessings to the crowd.[1]

Matthew 17:1-9

Here we note only that it is just the "three," Peter, James, and John, who attend the event with Jesus. This represents a further narrowing of focus; now the disciples themselves are distinguished from one another. This is to continue in the Mount of Olives scenes.

---

[1] It is customary to relate Jesus' feeding of the multitudes to Moses' providing manna to Israel in the wilderness. In light of our contention that Matthew in 17:1-9 views Jesus as replacing not just Moses or just Elijah, but a composite figure combining aspects of the two of them, it is noteworthy that Elijah too may be related to the motif of miraculous feeding. See for example I Kings 17:8-16, where the multiplication of the loaves and fishes in Matthew 15:34-37 finds a parallel in the "ever-full" jar and flask of I Kings 17:16.

Matthew 21:1-6, 24:3-25:46, 26:30-56

Matthew 21:1-6 details instructions for the triumphal entry. Two of the disciples appear as agents of Jesus' will (21:2, 6). The quotation in 21:5 of Zechariah 9:9 may point forward to the universal mission of 28:16-20, for the conclusion in Zechariah 9:10 speaks of the "king" as speaking to the "nations."

More important here is 24:3-25:46. Again Jesus "sits" upon the mount. This time the three disciples of the transfiguration account approach him for private teaching (24:3). To understand this teaching it is essential to understand its relation to 28:16-20. The latter describes the activity of the disciples during the period of missionary activity up until the "end of the age" (28:20).[1] Now 24:3-25:46 picks up where this activity leaves off; it describes the events belonging to the "end of the age" (24:3). Thus 28:16-20 looks to the preparations for the end, that is, to the conversion of the nations; 24:3-25:46 is teaching about the end itself. And when this arrives, conversion is no longer possible; then it is time to separate the tares, the worthless fish, and the goats from the δίκαιοι.[2] Thus the purpose of the apocalyptic discourse beginning in 24:3 is to aid its hearers in surviving to the conclusion of the tribulation; thus they will be saved. And the only

---

[1] We might borrow a leaf from Conzelmann's book and speak of a "period of the church."

[2] See 13:24-30, 13:47-50, and 25:31-46. We may recall that the period in which the "righteous" are to shine "in the kingdom" is not to be equated with the judgment, but follows upon the judgment, and is characterized by the shared life of glory in which Jesus and the true disciples participate.

XUM

"hearers" are disciples. Thus there is a reversal from this last of the five discourses and the first, the Sermon on the Mount. That was public teaching on discipleship, an invitation to all who were able to "hear," concerning life in the present age. This is esoteric teaching, available only to disciples, and concerning the "end of the age." Salvation is not of course limited to the three, or even to Jesus' current group of disciples; it must include those from among the "nations" who respond to the teaching of 28:16-20, and do not fall away from faith during the tribulations (24:10). That there is no question of a "general" conversion is plain from 24:9; the disciples must expect persecution from those men of "all nations" who do not respond to the mission work initiated in 28:16-20.

Matthew 26:30-56 is also important in Matthew's presentation of discipleship. The "striking the sheep" quoted in 26:31 from Zechariah 13:7 is also a definition of the event as the beginning of a period of testing for the disciples (cf. Zechariah 13:7-9 as a whole).[1] The use of ἐγείρω in 26:46 recalls both its usages in the passion predictions and in the transfiguration narrative itself. Finally, of course 26:32 points forward to the appearance in Galilee (28:16-20), which is a contrast to the "scattering" described in 26:31. The inauguration of the disciples' world-wide mission, then, is also to be the moment of their reconstitution as the body of Jesus' followers.

---

[1] In contrast to the "one-third" who remain faithful in Zechariah 13:7-9, all of Jesus' disciples abandon him. This emphasizes Jesus' solitude in completing his mission. Theologically it shows also that "all things are possible with God." The interest shifts to Jesus' foreknowledge, which makes all things--even their betrayal--a part of the divine plan.

XUM

The group of three disciples reappears in 26:30-46. The mention of Jesus' πρόσωπον, and the motif of falling (26:39), link the scene to Matthew's transfiguration account particularly. This time however it is Jesus who worships his Father; the disciples are also on the ground, but the contrast is sharply ironic, for they are sleeping.[1] The whole scene carefully develops the features of discipleship, especially as imitation of Jesus and as suffering. Jesus himself refers in his prayers to the "will" of the Father (26:29, 43-44); he must himself now pass the test of discipleship he had established for his followers, that one "do the will" of the Father (7:21). The prayers also mention the "cup" (26:39, 42, 44), of which the willingness to drink is another expression of true discipleship (20:20-23). We may go further still. In 26:41 the disciples are urged to pray that ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν. If this echoes any text in Matthew, it can only be 6:13, the petition that God μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν In other words, Jesus seems to suggest that his disciples repeat the Lord's Prayer, the prayer of the Sermon on the Mount, which he had offered as the typical prayer for his disciples (6:7-13). And a comparison of 26:39 with 26:41 will show the similarity of this to Jesus' own prayer in the garden. The disciples' prayer should be a reflection of their Lord's prayer, just as their sufferings are a reflection of his (cf. 10:24-25). Thus Matthew's scene in Gethsemane is hardly the traditional static picture of the lonely Jesus separated from his dull-witted disciples, but a dynamic presentation of Jesus' efforts to establish a community of followers even at this point in his own ministry. Even in Gethsemane he invites them, in language drawn from the first mountain of discipleship, to that true discipleship which consists of imitating himself, whether in prayer or in sufferings.

---

[1] It might be said in all seriousness that the disciples have failed the test put to the ten virgins (25:1-13). Fortunately for the disciples, this is not the moment of judgment.

Matthew 28:16-20

Matthew's gospel culminates upon the fifth and final mountain of discipleship.[1] The reference to the eleven as μαθηταί (28:16) is the final use of the term in Matthew; thus the mountains of discipleship span his references to the disciples (5:1, 28:16). Furthermore, the term "eleven" is itself significant. For this is the δώδεκα less Judas, and so is related to Matthew's uses of the δώδεκα μαθητάς, which are quite rare.[2] Both 20:17 and 26:20 are textually uncertain. The only clear references besides 28:16 are 10:1 and 11:1. Matthew has added the term μαθητάς to 10:1 (cf. Mark 3:14), and used it with 11:1 to "frame" the instructions for the mission to Israel. Thus the "eleven disciples" establishes 28:16-20 as a counterpart on the world-wide scale to the mission to Israel of 10:1-11:1.

---

[1] The classic treatment of the passage is Ernst Lohmeyer, "Mir ist gegeben alle Gewalt," in *In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer*, ed. Werner Schmauch (Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1951), pp. 22-49. The decisive recent treatment, of course, is Wolfgang Trilling, *Das Wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums*, 3rd., rev. ed. (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1964), pp. 21-51. But the pericope is hardly related to the transfiguration, nor indeed to the other mountains of discipleship. Matthew 17:1-9 does not appear in the Index. See now also Günther Bornkamm, "The Risen Lord and the Earthly Jesus: Mt 28:16-20" in *The Future of Our Religious Past*, trans. supv. and ed. James Robinson (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), pp. 203-29.

[2] At 26:14 and 26:47 he cannot bring himself to refer to Judas as one of the "twelve *disciples*," only as one of the "twelve."

XUM

The first serious difficulty is the meaning of οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς in 28:16. The mountain is clearly Matthew's addition to the predictions of Jesus' appearance in Galilee after the resurrection (26:30, 28:7, 10 and parallels). Usually οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς is referred only to the predictions of the appearance itself. A few have taken Matthew's reference to the mountain seriously and translated "the mountain where Jesus gave them commands."[1] This can only refer to the mount of 5:1-8:1, thus relating the "commands" of Jesus which must be transmitted to the nations to the initial teaching of Jesus which forms the basis of discipleship. Perhaps we can go even further. While τάσσω usually means "to arrange" or "to organize," it can mean "to establish" or "to appoint to a position of function."[2] Thus it is just possible that 28:16 could mean "the mount where Jesus had established them."[3] This could refer to 5:1-8:1, as containing the first teaching upon discipleship; but the reference is probably more general, to the five mountains of discipleship as a whole.

---

[1] Filson, Commentary, p. 304. But he finally inclines to the traditional approach to the text, as does M'Neile, Gospel, p. 434.

[2] In Acts 13:48 Paul's preaching produces belief in those ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. See also Habbakuk 1:12 (LXX), with reference to the Chaldeans, and II Chronicles 31:2 (LXX) on the appointment of priests and Levites by Hezekiah. II Samuel 7:11 mentions this in connection with the judges.

[3] It must be admitted that the examples in Blass and Debrunner, Greek Grammar, par. 409 (1), involve the infinitive form of the verb. On the whole finite forms of τάσσω prefer the accusative; but the use of the dative is well attested with "verbs of command." This would strengthen Filson's suggestion that 28:16 refers to "the mountain where Jesus gave them commands." The whole problem is worth closer examination.

XUM

These form, as a group, a theological rather than a geographical reality; they are the locus for Jesus' constitution of the band of his followers.

To understand 28:17 we must take the motifs of worship and doubt together. We suggested earlier that προσκυνέω now represents a true worship, purified of fear.[1] But it is not applicable to all--even after the resurrection--for "some doubted" (οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν). This must refer in part to others than the eleven; for it is both ludicrous and historically incorrect to limit the world-wide mission of 28:16-20 to the "eleven" upon the mount. But these invisible spectators who "doubt" must not be brought in as a deus ex machina to exempt the eleven from the possibility of "doubt." Since the disciples are clearly flawed during the ministry of Jesus, the question is whether the resurrection appearances have so changed them that their "doubt" is impossible.

We believe the answer to be "no." For Matthew the resurrection does not solve, but only intensifies, the problem of "clean and unclean" within the church. Thus it is the point of the parables of the tares and the dragnet that the distinction between true and false disciples is to be made only by God, and only at the end of history. The world-wide mission in no way alters this, since even afterward many will fall away (24:10). Perhaps we can "draw the stinger" from 28:17 by recalling the only other New Testament usage of ἐδίστασαν, Matthew 14:31--which is also the only other example in Matthew of the disciples "worshipping" Jesus.[2] It is the presence of Jesus in 14:31 which resolves Peter's doubt; and it is precisely the presence of Jesus which is promised the disciples throughout their mission (28:20). To exclude the eleven from the possibility of the "doubt" in 28:17 is to arrogate to ourselves the solution of "clean and unclean" within the church. Not our protection of the eleven, but the presence of Jesus promised in 28:20, is the answer to their "doubt."[1]

---

[1] See above, pp. 146-48.

[2] See above, p. 147.

In 28:18 Jesus "comes" (προσέρχομαι) to his disciples as at 17:7; again he is the Lord approaching his own disciples on his initiative. If 28:16-17 gives the setting for his command to the disciples, 28:18 gives the basis for the command: the commands of 28:19-20 are grounded in and reflect the ἐξουσία of 28:18 (this is the function of the οὖν, 28:19). The ἐξουσία exercised by Jesus over scripture on the first mount of discipleship (7:28), and over the powers of evil (8:27), has now been extended to "heaven and earth." Jesus through the resurrection has gained power over the "elemental spirits."[2] But something remains to be accomplished upon earth; Jesus' power must be made effective over "all nations" (28:19).[3] This has often, and correctly, been related to Daniel 7:14, but this alone is not enough. For it is the difference between Satan's offer upon the first of Matthew's seven mountains (4:8-10)

---

[1] This relates to the difficult problem of the "development" of the disciples. For a recent treatment with bibliography see Ulrich Luz, "Die Jünger im Matthäusevangelium," ZNTW 62 (1971): 141-171. The entire problem is misleading in that it shifts attention away from Jesus himself. Matthew sees "development" only in the sense that they cannot speak before Jesus' resurrection, and can afterward.

[2] Galatians 4:3, Colossians 2:8, 2:20.

[3] This offers a fascinating parallel to the apocalyptic correspondence of heaven and earth. For an excellent parable on this point see G. B. Caird, The Revelation of St John the Divine (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1966), pp. 60-61.

XUM

and the true authority given to Jesus upon the last of Matthew's mountains, not just that Jesus attains power through God rather than Satan, but that he requires a body of followers to actualize that power. The disciples are not a "supplement" to Jesus ministry; they are absolutely essential to his authority over "all nations." We have seen that the theme of discipleship as imitation of Jesus is important in Matthew; it culminates in the mission of 28:19-20, where the disciples share in Jesus' own authority in order to extend it over the nations, just as they shared in it to extend it over Israel in the first mission (10:1ff.). Thus Matthew depends upon Daniel 7:27 as much as 7:14, for the Son of man is not complete apart from the "people of the saints of the Most High."[1]

We have pointed out that 28:16-20 is the inauguration of the mission for which the disciples are commissioned in 17:7.[2] The charge for this mission--the inauguration-speech which signals its beginning--follows with the command to "go" in 28:19. In πορευθέντες is contained Matthew's destruction of Judaism. It exposes the reversal of several decisive themes in the Old Testament understanding of salvation. For to "go" means to leave the mountain and descend to the "world," where the true work of salvation awaits Jesus' disciples. But what precisely are the disciples leaving behind when they descend the mountain? It will not do merely to pass over the mountain in 28:16-20 as a traditional

---

[1] One might say that even if the Son of man is not himself a collective figure, his meaning is not fully realized apart from his followers.

[2] See pp. 148-56 above.

XUM

locus for a revelation-scene.[1] In view of the importance of the mountain in Matthew's gospel, and its function as a setting for examples of Jesus' saving activity, we believe that Matthew intends his "mountain" as a contrast to the sacred mountain of the Old Testament. Matthew's mountain is a New Zion.

In addition to the many references in the Old Testament to Zion as a focus of God's saving activity,[2] it is often described specifically as a "hill."[3] Psalm 146:10 defines the God of Zion as he who "gives sight to the blind"--an activity prominent in Jesus' ministry as well (Matthew 11:4-5 and elsewhere). Matthew's only usage of the term associates it with Jesus' saving mission; thus 21:5, a formula quotation from Zechariah 9:9, celebrates Jesus as "king." And in light of the universal mission of 28:19-20 it is significant that Zion is associated with the theme of God's universal dominion in the Old Testament. The agent of this dominion is the law.[4] With this Matthew agrees, but he makes a decisive alteration: the law of the Old Testament is replaced by the πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῶν of Jesus (28:20) as the basis for salvation in the new age.

---

[1] The resurrection accounts of the synoptics do not occur upon mountains. This in itself marks 28:16-20 as quite unusual.

[2] Psalm 14:7, 128:5, 132:13, 102:16, 51:18, Isaiah 14:32, 28:16 , 30:19, and 50:2 (the last two in related contexts).

[3] Psalm 48:2 describes Zion as God's "holy mountain"; see also Psalm 2:6, 78:68, 125:1-2, Isaiah 2:2-5, 48:2, Joel 2:1, Micah 1:7.

[4] Psalm 147:12, but the true exclusivism of this is shown in 147:19-20, where the commands of v. 12 are said to be inferior to the "statutes and decrees" given only to Jacob. A very clear expression of the cooperation of law and Zion is Micah 4:1-2. See also Isaiah 2:2ff.

Matthew alters the universalism of the Old Testament in another important way. That "universalism" is still based upon Zion; it admits the nations to the worship of the God of Israel, if they "come streaming" to Zion, and say, "Come, let us climb up on to the mountain of the Lord" (Micah 4:1-2 NEB). But for Matthew the salvation of the nations does not occur upon the mountain but precisely among the nations. They do not "stream" to the mountain; the disciples come down from the mountain and teach among them.[1] Thus Matthew's omissions in his one use of the term Σιών are highly significant. His quotation of Zechariah 9:9 (Matthew 24:5) omits the phrase "his cause won, his victory gained" (NEB); this is because the victory is not gained until the cross and resurrection. And he omits any reference to Zechariah 9:10, which includes the phrase "He shall speak peaceably to every nation, and his rule shall extend from sea to sea" (NEB); this is because his rule will not be realized among "all nations" until after the mission inaugurated in 28:16-20 (cf. 24:24).

Thus Matthew appears to establish the mountains in the gospel as a single mountain, a New Zion, only to disavow the concept of Zion as important for salvation. In this connection it is important that Jesus is presented according to 17:2 as the tabernacle bearing God's presence to the New Israel. For some Jewish traditions picture the tabernacle as a substitute for the mount of revelation, Sinai. Thus Josephus in

---

[1] This may imply yet another reversal at work in Matthew's transfiguration account. The reference to booths in 17:4 (Mark 9:5) has usually been related to the feast of tabernacles. Harrelson has pointed to Zechariah 14:16-21 as the most universalistic of all Old Testament passages, and notes this passage is concerned precisely with the feast of tabernacles. But the "bold image" of the nations worshipping in Jerusalem is still centered upon Zion, turning inward. See Walter Harrelson, "The Celebration of the Feast of Booths according to Zech. 14:16-21," in *Religions in Antiquity*, ed. Jacob Neusner (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968), pp. 88-96. On the nations coming to Zion see also Isaiah 2:2ff.

XUM

Antiquities 3. 100 explains the rationale for the tabernacle in this way:

> . . . . He desired that a tabernacle should be made for Him, whither He would descend whensoever He came among them, "to the intent," he said, "that when we move elsewhere we may take this with us and have no more need to ascend to Sinai, but that He himself, frequenting the tabernacle, may be present at our prayers. . . .

Of Moses it is said in 3. 212:

> Desisting from further ascents of Sinai, he now entered the tabernacle and there received responses on all that he besought from God; dressed like any ordinary person, in all else he bore himself as a simple commoner, who desired in nothing to appear different from the crowd, save only in being seen to have their interests at heart.[1]

Here Sinai is seen as a limitation of God's presence with Israel to a particular place, and the ascent of Sinai almost for Moses a temptation, drawing him away from the proper work of service to the common people. The future of God's people demands that the mountain be given up.[2]

We must postpone a full discussion of this until the treatment of Jesus' promise to "be with" the disciples (28:20). For the moment we only point out that Matthew must have viewed the leaving behind of the mountain in light of the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 A.D. A Jewish view upon this event is the remarkable statement in II Baruch 20:1: "therefore have I now taken away Zion, that I may the more speedily visit

---

[1] See also 3. 222, where he speaks of "Moses, no longer ascending Mount Sinai but entering into the tabernacle. . . ."

[2] Perhaps this is related to the idea that the Old Testament, and prophecy in particular, suppresses the mountain in order to establish the supremacy of God's rule (that is, "centers of holiness" give way before the Lord who is holy). On this see Werner Foerster, TWNT 5: 482-83. But Matthew's lowering of the mountain does not intend to shift attention to God in heaven, but precisely to the disciples--as bearers of Jesus' words--who are working among the nations here on earth.

XUM

the world in its season." This seems to mean that since there is now no hope for a restoration of glory to Israel as a historical entity, God can only be hastening to his goal of a New Israel, to be inaugurated through a judgment upon the world. Thus for II Baruch the destruction of the temple indicated God's determination to purify and restore Israel. For Matthew it must have been another proof of the passing away of Judaism before the New Israel constituted by Jesus. It did not hasten the way to God's judgment upon Israel, leading to her purification and restoration; it was the final judgment upon Israel, with nothing more to be expected. The future now lay with those who accepted the lordship of Jesus.[1]

Hence Matthew pictures Jesus as directing the disciples away from the mountain. It must be left behind as something seductive and dangerous, which will meet its judgment along with Judaism. The descent of the mountain by the disciples is equivalent to the rending of the temple veil (Matthew 27:51). And as the mountain was seductive for Israel, so may it be for the New Israel. The locus of the encounter with Jesus must not become a new sacred place, diverting attention away from the world mission and localizing Jesus' relationship with his followers in one spot. He will be "with them" always, even on their mission. And to achieve this mission even the mountains of discipleship must be sacrificed.

---

[1] This understanding of the significance of the mountain and its descent is strengthened if we accept Jeremias' identification of the seven mountains of I Enoch as signifying Jerusalem. See Jeremias, Golgatha, p. 52, and the discussion on p. 110 above. He says in part: "Die auffällige Verteilung der Berge im Süden und Osten erklärt sich daraus, dass der Verfasser Jerusalem vor Augen hat. . . ." He cites also Pirqe RE 10 as a Rabbinic confirmation of his interpretation; see ibid., n. 12. The citation reads: ירושלם על שבעה הרים היא עומדה. The descent ordered in 28:19 represents the descent of all Matthew's mountains--all seven.

The mission is now characterized as "making disciples of all men" (28:19). μαθητεύω is used apart from Matthew only in Acts 14:21, also in connection with mission work. But Matthew's other uses will show that the term is not limited to the mission field.[1] Its use in 28:19 signifies, then, that "discipleship," which up to now has been for the followers of Jesus a noun, becomes a verb. Their primary activity is no longer merely being a disciple, but now includes bringing others to the place of discipleship as well.[2] The disciples are not a privileged and self-contained group in Matthew; their primary function is to bring others to the same status as themselves.

The "nations" are to be distinguished from the "world." The ἔθνη are to be distinguished from the κόσμος as it appears in 4:8, 5:14, 13:35, 13:38, 16:26, 18:7, 24:21, 25:34.[3] This is neither a positive nor a negative term. It merely refers to the world of human affairs. The ἔθνη, however, is mankind in its relationship to God, as those who stand apart from the promises to Israel (Matthew 6:32) and are hostile to the Lord's messengers (10:18, 24:9), but also as those who "hope" in the Lord (12:18-21, quoting Isaiah 42:1-4). It is mankind in this dimension, mankind with a spiritual destiny for salvation or destruction, to whom the disciples are sent (28:19) and to whom judgment will come (25:32).

---

[1] See 27:51, Joseph of Arimathea, and 13:52, the "scribe" now a disciple.

[2] This has been prepared for in Matthew 10.

[3] On the problem of the "world" see Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, Tradition and Interpretation, passim.

The process of "making disciples" is two-fold, consisting of baptizing and teaching (28:19-20).[1] While teaching has characterized Jesus' ministry, baptism belongs only to the "period of the church"--that is, to the time after the resurrection during which the world-wide mission is conducted. The baptism of new disciples may be regarded as another example of their imitating Jesus; his own baptism was done in order to fulfill "all righteousness," and the life of the disciple is to be characterized by "righteousness."[2] The problems connected with baptism in the three-fold name cannot be solved here; we point out only that it reflects the church as a decisive structure in Matthew's own generation. The new disciple does not enter an esoteric relation, clinging to Jesus alone, but into a community which celebrates the saving work of the Father and Spirit as well. It is interesting, however, that the "name" characterizes one's identification with the faith. During Jesus' ministry the "name" has signified the intimate relationship of the disciples with their Lord (18:5, 18:20, 10:22), and it will be the occasion for their persecution by the "nations" later on (24:9-13).[3]

The second aspect of the mission is teaching. This along with preaching and healing has been one of the characteristic activities of

---

[1] It is just possible that the two terms refer to different aspects of the Christian life. Baptism is "theology," tokening one's new relation to the world of spiritual reality; teaching relates this world to the everyday world of affairs and makes it concrete.

[2] See pp. 125-27 above.

[3] On the name see Barth's discussion in Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, Tradition and Interpretation, pp. 134-35. Matthew may also be making the point that the nations, who "hope in his name," are now receiving the message--see Isaiah 42:1-4, quoted in Matthew 12:18-21.

Jesus' ministry;[1] it is now applied to the disciples, and is thus the last of these activities to be extended to them.[2] They have been warned that participation in this aspect of Jesus' ministry will lead to persecution (10:24).

The teaching ministry of the disciples is the key to one of Matthew's most puzzling discipleship passages, 13:51-52. This must be interpreted in light of its context. It concludes the discourse on discipleship, including parables of the kingdom, which occupies most of Matthew 13. The διὰ τοῦτο of 13:52 shows that it is intended as a response to the disciples' claim that they have "understood" the teaching. Thus 13:52 is intended as a description or summary of this teaching, the main point of which is the discrimination between true and false discipleship to be accomplished by God (13:24-30, 36-43, 47-50). Now 13:51-52 translates this into terms of scribal activity. The point is that the scriptures too contain both "good" and "bad" elements, just as does the church in this age. The γραμματεύς must be taken in its literal sense and not merely as a "student" or "learner."[3] For the point is that all of one's life is to be brought under the lordship of Jesus, even, if one is a γραμματεύς, his work of interpreting scripture.

---

[1] See 4:23 and 9:35. On teaching as characteristic see also 7:28, 21:23, and the description of Jesus' passion week activities as "teaching in the temple" in 26:55, where the significant addition is made to Mark 14:49 that Jesus was "sitting." The special place of "teaching" in Jesus' ministry and the disciples' activities is noted most recently in Perrin, Introduction, p. 175.

[2] It is striking that preaching and healing are not included in 28:19.

[3] The latter is represented by the NEB in translating 13:51.

XUM

His task is now to discriminate between good and bad even within the scriptures, determining what in them belongs to the old age (the παλαιά), and what to the new age (the καινά). If we recall that Jesus' ἐξουσία in 7:28 consisted in his treatment of the scriptures, it is apparent that 13:51-52 merely extends to the believing γραμματεύς an activity characteristic of Jesus' own ministry.[1]

It is also striking that this passage contains one of the rare uses of the term μαθητεύω . Thus the mission activity of 28:19-20 is somehow associated with the activity of the believing scribe in 13:51-52. The connection can only be those "things which Jesus has commanded," which are to be the content of the mission teaching; for it is these commands which embody Jesus' "authority" with regard to the scriptures. The words of Jesus will certainly be foremost among the "new" which the believing scribe treasures. But we have also seen that the scribe is to bring his own skills to the task of interpretation. The teaching mission of the disciples, perhaps, is not to be merely the repetition of a catechism, but a mission calling for their own creative understanding of the scriptures and their own interpretative work.[2] Each disciple must practise his own hermeneutic!

---

[1] This material was completed before Perrin's new work was available. On 13:51-52 see now Perrin, Introduction, p. 175.

[2] The mission application of 13:51-52 is considerably strengthened by the use of οἰκονόμος in 13:52. The term is not common; it does not appear to be used in the LXX, and is used in the New Testament only in the gospels. For Matthew it applies--except for the Q passage 24:43--to the kingdom and the divine action of judgment at the end of the age, or in parables showing Jesus' authority. See for example 20:11, 21:33, 13:27, and 10:25. The use in 13:52 is, I believe, the only one not referring either to Jesus or another figure of authority, such as the householder in the parable. Thus its use in 13:51-52 gives a surprising eschatological twist to the passage.

XUM

The disciples are to teach πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν. The term emphasizes Jesus' role as the authoritative lawgiver: it is used of Moses in 19:7 and of God in 15:4. And Matthew's only use with regard to Jesus occurs at the conclusion of the transfiguration narrative, when Jesus "commands" the three disciples not to reveal their ὅραμα until after the resurrection (17:9).

We have seen in connection with Deuteronomy 18:15ff. and Malachi 3:23 (LXX) that the expectation of a "prophet" emphasized the importance of the law as the basis for life in the eschatological age.[1] It is precisely Jesus' commands that, according to Matthew, are the basis for life in the new age; this is why they are the content for the disciples' mission teaching. It is even stated of them that although heaven and earth pass away, Jesus' words will not pass away (24:35).[2] Once again there is an interesting and important contrast with II Baruch:

> For thou shalt surely depart from this earth, nevertheless not unto death, but thou shalt be preserved unto the consummation of the time. Go up therefore to the top of that mountain, and there shall pass before thee all the regions of that land, and the figure of the inhabited world, and the top(s) of the mountains, and the depth(s) of the valleys, and the depths of the seas, and the number of the rivers, that thou mayst see what thou art leaving, and whither thou art going. Now this shall befall after forty days. Go now there-

---

[1] See the discussion on pp. 128-42 above.

[2] It is interesting that Jeremiah 1:9-10 sees the "words" as the basis of Jeremiah's now being set "over nations and over kingdoms." The words, that is, have power from God and themselves convey the authority of God. It is now the words from Jesus' mouth (Matthew 5:2) which are the basis of the disciples' mission to "all nations"--and in this they share in his authority.

XUM

> fore during these days and instruct the people so far as thou art able, that they may learn so as not to die at the last time, but may learn in order that they may live at the last times (76:2-4).

In view of his impending assumption, Baruch is to instruct the people; it is clear from 77:3-4 and 77:15-16 that the law is the content of the instruction. According to Matthew it is Jesus' words as transmitted by his disciples which are the basis for life in the new age. Thus while II Baruch looks to the removal of the prophet from the scene, Matthew looks to the continuing presence of Jesus through the mission activity of his disciples.

May we now go further and speak of a more literal presence of Jesus with his disciples upon the mission? Not only is there no scene depicting Jesus' assumption, as anticipated of Baruch and detailed of Jesus himself in Luke 24:50-52, but there is the solemn asseveration of Matthew 28:20b: καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος. Now the promise of Jesus' presence is the culmination of several themes developed already. We saw that Jesus is presented in Matthew's transfiguration as the tabernacle, filled with the presence of God.[1] The point of the tabernacle, according to both Exodus 40:36-40 and Josephus, is that Israel is no longer tied to one location--even a mountain-top--in order to experience God's presence; they can go on their way in the world with God's presence, mediated through the tabernacle, directing them "at every stage of their journey" (Exodus 40:36 NEB). If Jesus is the tabernacle, then he must be thought of as being present with his disciples throughout their mission journey. Jesus goes down from the mountain with the disciples, and enters into the mission in the world alongside them, mediating God's presence to them and directing them in their endeavors.[1] He himself completes the number of the twelve after the defection of Judas.[2] Twelve left upon the mission to Israel of 10:1-11:1; now twelve leave upon the world-wide mission of 28:19-20.

---

[1] This is a correction of the opinion of Barth in Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, Tradition and Interpretation, p. 135, that Jesus meets the disciples in 28:16-20 as the shekinah itself. It is better to say he is the tabernacle filled with the shekinah.

It remains only to consider the time of the mission, ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος (28:20). The combination of συντελείας and αἰῶνος is rare and Matthean, the only other New Testament usage being Hebrews 9:26. It refers specifically in Matthew to the time of the final judgment (13:39, 40, 49, and 24:3), the end of the age, and particularly as the time when false disciples will be separated from the true. During this Jesus will preside in judgment over all men (25:32), including his disciples (13:39-42, 7:21-23). Thus the συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος points the way forward to the time when the Lord will live with his true disciples in the kingdom (13:43). The final words of Matthew's gospel, upon the climactic mountain of discipleship, echo the demand for faithfulness to the Lord--but also the promise of glory offered the true disciple through Jesus' transformation in 17:2.

---

[1] This idea was originally suggested to me by Professor Herman Waetchen. It is interesting to note that Philo speaks of Moses as a citizen of the world rather than any one particular country. On this see the Life of Moses 1. 157.

[2] For the importance of this in the early church, see Acts 1:15-26, and also the very presence of several different lists of the twelve in the sources.

XUM

Summary

This completes our survey of Matthew's five mountains of discipleship. These are the method whereby the theology of Matthew's transfiguration account is integrated into the structure of his gospel as a whole. The mountains present Jesus interacting with his disciples both to deepen their own discipleship and to extend their discipleship further and further into the "world." In the beginning they are not distinguished from the "crowd"; they receive general teaching on discipleship (5:1-8:1). In 15:29-39 they are distinguished from the crowds, and, as participants in Jesus' ministry, mediate his blessings to the crowd. In 17:1-9, 24:3-25:46, and 26:30-56, Jesus instructs three of the disciples in his nature (and, ultimately, in their own), in the details of the end of the age, and in the necessity of suffering as a part of discipleship. Then in 28:16-20 the focus broadens again, and the eleven are sent upon a mission (Jesus himself making the twelve complete once again) to extend Jesus' teaching to "all nations."

Thus the mountains of discipleship are mountains of equipping, sharing, testing, and inaugurating of the disciples for the ministry of Jesus. But always the decisive thing is Jesus himself; and at the end even the mountain itself must be given up for the sake of the mission to the world.

Conclusion: The Purpose of Matthew 17:1-9

We have approached Matthew's transfiguration account as a study in discipleship. We have found that this yields an understanding of Matthew 17:1-9 which is both internally consistent and cohesive with the view of discipleship in Matthew's gospel as a whole. Furthermore, this theological understanding is integrated into the gospel as a whole through its inclusion in a pattern of five mountains of discipleship. Of these the mount of transfiguration is the central element; and it points again and again toward the final and climactic mountain of discipleship, that of 28:16-20. The mount of transfiguration is the vantage point from which best to comprehend that of the mission charge. For it is upon the mount of transfiguration that the disciples see Jesus as the tabernacle, the presence of God which is to accompany them on their world-wide mission; that they are commissioned as bearers of that law which is to be the content of their mission work, those commandments of Jesus which are to be decisive for life in the new age; and that they see in Jesus a foretaste of the shining radiance awaiting those disciples who, faithful to Jesus, "endure to the end" (24:13) and thus share life with their Lord in the kingdom of their Father (13:43).

XUM

CONCLUSION

DISCIPLESHIP AS TRANSFIGURATION
IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

The transfiguration claims a position of special importance in Matthew's gospel. It is decisive for an understanding of Matthew's concept of discipleship in general, and the disciples' mission of 28:16-20 in particular. And since we now live in the time of that mission, it should be decisive for us as well.

If we now look beyond the details of Matthew's transfiguration account, beyond the linguistic minutiae, the structural theories, and the endless analyses of the "higher criticism," there are, it seems to me, three results of supreme importance to come from our investigations. We may cast these in terms of the church for which Matthew's account was written.

Firstly, it is a community for which the past, the present, and the future are not to be understood apart from one another. The present—which is always with Jesus' disciples—is the actualization of an authority already established in the past (28:19). But the activity of the church is never an end in itself; it looks forward to a goal in God's future, to the judgment (24:14, 25:31-46). Thus Matthew's church certainly has a "realized" eschatology, for Jesus is with them, even on the mission (28:20). But it is not completely "realized." So Matthew's church maintains the tension between "already" and "not yet" so characteristic of much of the New Testament. It has not given up the future orientation, as has the gospel of John; nor has it subordinated it to the demands of the world mission, as has Luke-Acts. For the mission itself is conducted with a view to the future judgment (24:14). But, in light of Matthew's transfiguration account, we may say that the real focus of the life and work of his church lies beyond even this. For they have been given an intimation of that life which awaits them, beyond the judgment, in the kingdom of the Father (17:2, 13:43). The parousia is not the end, but only the beginning.

Secondly, Matthew's community cannot understand itself apart from the "world." Its place is not upon the mountain, or in any sacred place, but precisely among the "nations." The church is a mission church. The goal of discipleship is the bringing of others to discipleship. For this the disciples have been commissioned in Matthew's transfiguration account (17:7, 9). In view of the "Jewishness" of Matthew's church we must remember that this is a mission to the Gentiles (the ἔθνη of 28:19), which now supersedes the mission in Matthew 10 to "Israel." Thus it represents a basic shift in mission strategy for Matthew's church. "Israel" does not equal "Palestine"; Matthew 10 is cast in terms of Jesus' earthly ministry, but the appearance of Gentile officials in 10:18 shows that it refers to a mission previously attempted among diaspora Judaism as well. Matthew's church stands at the point when the Jewish mission is being given up in favor of the Gentile mission.

Now Paul too stands on the other side of this decision. But he

XUM

has given up the decisive things of Judaism, such as the law, in favor of a new freedom in Christ (Galatians 5:1). Matthew's church has taken another approach. They have maintained the forms of Judaism, but have filled them with Jesus rather than Moses: Jesus' words are the key to life in the new age (28:19). Perhaps the best parallel to Matthew's church is not Paul the Christian missionary to the Gentiles after his conversion, but Paul the Jewish missionary to the Gentiles before his conversion[1]--with the essential difference that the content of the mission work is Jesus rather than Judaism. But in any case the church recognizes the imperative of the Gentile mission, but without as yet giving up the essential Jewish forms.[2] This can only be a testimony to the inexorable expansion of Jesus' Spirit further and further into the "world."[3]

Finally, Matthew's church cannot understand itself apart from Jesus--nor can it understand Jesus apart from itself. The church is to practise the imitation of Jesus (10:25); but Jesus cannot actualize his authority over "all nations" apart from his disciples (24:14). They convey his words as the basis of life in the new age. Their suffering is evidence of their loyalty to him (10:25). And, above all, their final destiny has been revealed, in Matthew's transfiguration account, as one and the same with Jesus' essential nature: they too are to "shine" in the kingdom of the Father (17:2, 13:43).

---

[1] For this view see now Perrin, Introduction, pp. 90-91.

[2] While I believe this is a new insight, it certainly echoes the emphasis of Bornkamm in Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, Tradition and Interpretation, p. 39: "Thus Matthew's conception of the Church remains imprisoned in the Jewish tradition, yet it is peculiarly opened in the direction of the Gentile world."

[3] It is no accident that the book of Acts presents the expansion of the church as the doing of God rather than of men. Could the figure of Peter have some special significance as a representative of Matthew's position? For he appears in Acts as something of a bridge between the Jewish and Gentile wings of the church (cf. Acts 10:1-48--Cornelius). This is confirmed in a backhanded way by Paul himself in Galatians 2:14.

Another difference from Paul appears at this point. For Paul, "the future is now." In what is the ultimate democratization of the synoptic transfiguration tradition, Paul claims that every believer is to assume the marks of glory within this life (II Corinthians 3:18). Probably he is attacking those who claim that only they--the spiritual supermen--are to be "transformed."[1] Now Matthew is interested in the transformation of believers, but only of the "true" believers. And since this cannot be determined until the final judgment (13:24-30, 13:36-40, 25:31-46), for Matthew the transformation must wait until the establishment of the kingdom of the Father which will follow that judgment. One may call this--in contrast to the democratizing approach of Paul--an "elitism," but at least it is an elitism based on radical obedience instead of arrogance. It is hardly the elitism of Paul's opponents!

The radiance which is the disciples' true nature remains hidden, as indeed did Jesus' radiance except for a brief moment at 17:1-9. But that which has been revealed to them upon the mount will finally emerge as the destiny of those who "endure to the end" (24:13). In light of 17:1-9 we may speak of discipleship as transfiguration in Matthew's gospel. But, in contrast to Paul, for Matthew this will become manifest only in God's good time.

---

[1] Georgi, Gegner, pp. 145ff., 192, 220ff., 258ff., 282ff.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, W. C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew.* International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1951.

Arvedson, Tomas. *Das Mysterium Christi*. Uppsala: Lundeqvistska, 1937. Pp. 126-32.

Bacon, Benjamin W. "After Six Days: A New Clue for Gospel Critics." *Harvard Theological Review* 8 (1915): 94-121.

________. *Studies in Matthew*. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1930. Pp. 146, 404.

________. "The Transfiguration Story." *American Journal of Theology* 6 (1902): 236-65.

Baltensweiler, Heinrich. *Die Verklärung Jesu: Historisches Ereignis und synoptische Berichte*. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1959.

Barry, George D. *The Transfiguration of Our Lord*. New York: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1911. Pp. 103-123.

Baur, Ferdinand Christian. *Das Markusevangelium nach seinem Ursprung und Charakter*. Tübingen: Fues, 1851. Pp. 67-70.

Behm, Johannes. Article " μορφή ." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. 4: pp. 742-59.

Bengel, John Albert. *Gnomon of the New Testament*. 2 vols. 7th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1857.

Bernardin, Joseph B. "The Transfiguration." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 52 (1933): 181-89.

Betz, Hans Dieter. "Jesus as Divine Man." In *Jesus and the Historian*, pp. 114-33. Edited by F. Thomas Trotter. Philadelphia, Pa.: Westminster Press, 1968.

Bieler, Ludwig. θεῖος ἀνήρ. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967.

Blinzler, Joseph. *Die Neutestamentlichen Berichte über die Verklärung Jesu*. Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1937.

XUM

Boobyer, G. H. "St. Mark and the Transfiguration." *Journal of Theological Studies* 41 (1940): 119-40.

________. *St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1942.

Bornkamm, Günther. "The Risen Lord and the Earthly Jesus: Mt. 28:16-20." In *The Future of Our Religious Past*, pp. 203-29. Edited by James M. Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Bornkamm, Günther; Barth, Gerhard; and Held, Heinz Joachim. *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. Translated by Percy Scott. Philadelphia, Pa.: Westminster Press, 1963.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. Rev. ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1968. Pp. 259-261, 309, 432-33.

Burkill, T. A. *Mysterious Revelation*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1963. Pp. 156ff., 180ff.

Caird, George B. "The Transfiguration." *Expository Times* 67 (1955): 291-94.

Carlston, Charles E. "Transfiguration and Resurrection." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80 (1961): 233-40.

Coune, M. "La Transfiguration dans l'exégèse des sept premiers siècles." *Assemblées du Seigneur* 28 (1962): 64-80.

Cranfield, C. E. B. *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. The Cambridge Greek Commentary. General Editor, C. F. D. Moule. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1963. Pp. 289-96.

Currie, Stuart D. "Isaiah 63:9 and the Transfiguration in Mark." *Austin Seminary Bulletin* 82 (1966): 7-34.

Dabeck, P. "Siehe, es erschienen Moses und Elias." *Biblica* 23 (1942): 175-89.

Dabrowski, Eugene. *La Transfiguration de Jésus*. Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, no. 85. Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1939.

Daube, David. *The Sudden in the Scriptures*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964. Pp. 32ff., 47, 56, 72.

Davies, J. G. "The Prefigurement of the Ascension in the Third Gospel." *Journal of Theological Studies* 6 (1955): 229-33.

XUM

Davies, W. D. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1964. Pp. 50-56, 99.

________. *Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come*. Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, no. 7. Philadelphia, Pa.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952.

Dodd, C. H. *The Bible and the Greeks*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1964. Pp. 150-51, 158-59, 236.

________. "The Framework of the Gospel Narratives." In *New Testament Studies*, pp. 1-11. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952.

Eichinger, Matthias. *Die Verklärung Christi bei Origenes*. Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie, no. 23. Vienna: Verlag Herder, 1972. Pp. 19-21, 123-62.

Feine, Paul. *Jesus Christus und Paulus*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902. Pp. 144-49.

Fenton, J. C. *The Gospel of St. Matthew*. Pelican Gospel Commentaries. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963. Pp. 274-78.

Feuillet, A. "Les perspectives propres à chaque évangéliste dans les récits de la transfiguration." *Biblica* 39 (1958): 281-301.

Filson, Floyd V. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. Harper's New Testament Commentaries. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960. Pp. 190-93.

________. "Broken Patterns in the Gospel of Matthew." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 75 (1956): 227-31.

Foerster, Werner. Article " ὄρος ." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. 5: pp. 563-72.

Gaechter, Paul. *Das Matthäus Evangelium*. Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1963. Pp. 563-72.

________. *Die Literarische Kunst im Matthäus-Evangelium*. Stuttgart Bibel-Studien, no. 7. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, n.d. Pp. 71-77.

Gaster, Theodore H. *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament*. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Gennarini, S. "Le principali interpretazioni postliberali della pericope della trasfigurazione di Gesù." *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* 8 (1972): 80-132.

Georgi, Dieter. *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964.

Gerber, W. "Die Metamorphose Jesu, Mark. 9,2f. par." Theologische Zeitschrift 23 (1967): 385-95.

Grotius, Hugh. Annotationes in Vetus & Novum Testamentum. London: Smith, 1727. Pp. 68-69.

Gundry, Robert H. The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

Hadas, Moses, and Smith, Morton. Heroes and Gods: Spiritual Biographies in Antiquity. New York: Harper & Row, 1965. Pp. 18, 23-25, 131, 162-63.

Hahn, Ferdinand. The Titles of Jesus in Christology. Translated by H. Knight and G. Ogg. London: Lutterworth Press, 1969.

Hare, Douglas R. A. The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Harrelson, Walter. "The Celebration of the Feast of Booths according to Zechariah 14:16-21." In Religions in Antiquity, pp. 86-96. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.

Hartman, L. "Scriptural Exegesis in the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Problem of Communication." In L'Évangile selon Matthieu, pp. 131-52. Edited by M. Didier. Gembloux, Belgium: Duculot, 1972.

Heick, Otto W. "The Use of the verb HAPTO in the New Testament." Lutheran Church Quarterly 12 (1939): 90-95.

Höller, Josef. Die Verklärung Jesu: Eine Auslegung der neutestamentlichen Berichte. Freiburg: Herder, 1937.

Jeremias, Joachim. Article "Ἡλ(ε)ίας." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 2: pp. 928-41.

_______. Article "Μωυσῆς." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 4: pp. 848-873.

_______. Golgotha. Archiv für neutestlamentliche Zeitgeschichte und Kulturkunde, no. 1. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1926. P. 52.

_______. Article "παῖς θεοῦ C.-D." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 5: pp. 677-717.

Johnson, Sherman E. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark. Harper's New Testament Commentaries. New York: Harper & Row, 1960. Pp. 154-58.

Kee, Howard Clark. "The Transfiguration in Mark: Epiphany or Apocalyptic Vision?" In *Understanding the Sacred Text*, pp. 137-52. Edited by John Reumann. Valley Forge, Pa.: Judson Press, 1972.

Kelber, Werner. *The Kingdom in Mark*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1974.

Kilpatrick, G. D. *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Clarendon Press, 1946.

Lagrange, M.-J. *Évangile selon Saint Matthieu*. 8th ed. Paris: Gabalda, 1948. Pp. 334-37.

Leon-Dufour, Xavier. "La Transfiguration de Jésus." In *Etudes d'Evangile*, pp. 83-122. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1965.

Lightfoot, R. H. *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Galaxy Books, 1962. Pp. 42-44, 117-18.

Lohmeyer, Ernst, and Schmauch, Werner. *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*. 3rd. ed. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962. Pp. 266-69.

Lohmeyer, Ernst. "Mir ist gegeben alle Gewalt." In *In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer*, pp. 22-49. Edited by Werner Schmauch. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1951.

________. "Die Verklärung Jesu nach dem Markus-Evangelium." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 21 (1922): 185-215.

Loisy, Alfred. *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*. 2 vols. Haute-Marne: Affonds, 1907. Vol. 2: pp. 29-45.

M'Neile, Alan H. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*. London: Macmillan, 1952. Pp. 248-52.

Martin, R. A. "A Semitic Source in the Lukan Transfiguration." Paper read at the April 20, 1974 meeting of the Chicago Society for Biblical Research.

Masson, Charles. "La Transfiguration de Jésus." *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*. Series 3, 14 (1964): 1-14.

Meeks, Wayne A. *The Prophet-King*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

Meyer, Rudolf. Article "προφήτης, C." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. 6: pp. 812-28.

Michaelis, Wilhelm. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. 2 vols. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1948. Vol. 2: pp. 375-87.

________. Article " ὁράω " Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 5: pp. 315-82.

________. Article " σκήνη ." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 7: pp. 368-94.

Müller, Hans-Peter. "Die Verklärung Jesu." Zeitschrift für die Neutestlamentliche Wissenschaft 51 (1960): 56-64.

Nepper-Christensen, Paul. Das Matthäusevangelium: Ein Judenchristliches Evangelium? Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1958. Pp. 173-77.

Oepke, A. Article " λάμπω ." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 4: pp. 16-28.

________. Article "νεφέλη, νέφος ." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 4: 902-910.

Percy, Ernst. Die Botschaft Jesu. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1953. Pp. 300-307.

Perrin, Norman. The New Testament: An Introduction. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1974.

________. "Towards an Interpretation of the Gospel of Mark." University of Chicago Divinity School.

Pope, Marvin H. Article "7, Seventh, Seventy." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. 4: pp. 294-95.

Riesenfeld, Harald. Jésus Transfiguré. Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, no. 16. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1947.

Rigaux, Beda. Témoignage de l'évangile de Matthieu. Paris: Brouwer, 1967.

Rivera, Luis F. "Interpretatio Transfigurationis Jesu in redactione evangelii Marci." Verbum Domini 46 (1968): 99-1-4.

________. "El Relato de la Transfiguracion En Lucas (9:28-36)." Revista Biblica 28 (1966): 148-64.

________. "El Relato de la Transfiguracion en Mateo: Estudio de critica literaria." Revista Biblica 26 (1964): 31-40.

________. "El Relato de la Transfiguracion en la Redaccion del Evangelico de Marcos." Revista Biblica 31 (1969): 143-58, 229-43.

XUM

Robinson, James M., and Koester, Helmut. *Trajectories Through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1971. Pp. 48-49, 59-61.

Robinson, John A. T. "The Most Primitive Christology of All?" In *12 New Testament Studies*, pp. 139-53. Studies in Biblical Theology. London: SCM Press, 1962.

Sabbe, M. "De Transfigurate van Jezus." *Collationes Brugenses et Gandavenses* 4 (1958): 467-503.

Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Evangelist Matthäus*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1957. Pp. 525-531.

Schulz, Siegfried. Article "ἐπισκιάζω." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. 7: pp. 394-400.

Schweitzer, Albert. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Translated by W. Montgomery. New York: Macmillan Co., 1969. Pp. 84, 382ff.

Smith, Morton. "The Aretalogy Used by Mark." Protocol of the Sixth Colloquy of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture. Edited by W. Wuellner. Berkeley, Ca.: Graduate Theological Union and University of California-Berkeley, 1974.

________. "Prolegomena to a Discussion of Aretalogies, Divine Men, the Gospels, and Jesus." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 174-99.

Swete, Henry Barclay. *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. 186-92.

Taylor, Vincent. *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan & Co., 1966. Pp. 386-92.

Thrall, Margaret E. "Elijah and Moses in Mark's Account of the Transfiguration." *New Testament Studies* 16 (1970): 305-17.

Trilling, Wolfgang. *Das Wahre Israel*. 3rd ed. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1964.

Trench, R. C. "The Transfiguration." Chapter 8 in *Studies in the Gospels*, pp. 184-214. New York: Scribner & Co., 1867.

Volz, Paul. *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr-Paul Siebeck, 1934. Pp. 194-97.

Wansbrough, Henry. Article "Matthew." *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*. Pp. 934-35.

Weiss, Bernhard. Das Matthäus Evangelium und seine Lucas-Parallelen. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1876. Pp. 398ff.

_______. Das Matthäus-Evangelium. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898. Pp. 304-6.

Wellhausen, Johannes. Das Evangelium Marci übersetzt und erklärt. Berlin: Reimer, 1903. Pp. 74-77.

_______. Das Evangelium Matthaei. Berlin: Reimer, 1902. Pp. 86-88.

Wetstein, John Jacob. Novum Testamentum Graecum cum variis Lectionibus et Commentario Duobus Tomis. Amsterdam: Dommeriana, 1751. Vol. I: pp. 434-37.

Wilkens, Johannes. Der König Israels. Berlin: Furche-Verlag, 1934.

Zahn, Theodor. Das Evangelium des Matthäus. Leipzig: A. Deichert (Böhme), 1905. Pp. 552-57.

Ziesler, J. A. "The Transfiguration Story and the Markan Soteriology." Expository Times 81 (1970): 263-68.

XUM